



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

PROCEEDINGS  
OF THE  
AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY,  
AT ITS  
MEETING IN PHILADELPHIA, PENN.,  
December 27th, 28th, and 29th, 1894.

---

THE meeting of the American Oriental Society in Philadelphia, at the University of Pennsylvania, December 27, 28, 29, 1894, was held in accordance with a vote passed at the annual meeting in New York, March 29-31, 1894, which provided that a joint meeting should be held with various other associations. The committee to whom the arrangements for the joint meeting were entrusted having conferred with similar committees representing the other associations which intended to participate in the meeting, it was decided that such joint meeting should be made commemorative of the services of the late Professor William Dwight Whitney, who had passed away on June 7, 1894.

The following organizations took part in the joint meeting :

AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY,  
AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION,  
MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,  
SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS,  
AMERICAN DIALECT SOCIETY,  
SPELLING REFORM ASSOCIATION,  
ARCHÆOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OF AMERICA.

These societies held three joint sessions.

On Thursday, December 27, at 12 m., the societies having assembled in the large hall of the library of the University of Pennsylvania, addresses were made by Mr. C. C. Harrison, Acting Provost of the University, by Professor A. Marshall Elliott of the Johns Hopkins University, President of the Modern Language Association and presiding officer of the session, and by Dr. Horace Howard Furness of Philadelphia.

At the close of the opening joint session the Local Committee announced the places of meeting of the various societies; a luncheon to be served to all members by the University of Pennsylvania; a dinner at six o'clock P. M., at one dollar per person, in the Bullitt Building, to which all were invited; a reception by the Provost and Trustees in the Library Building of the University from eight to eleven o'clock P. M.; an invitation to attend the monthly reception of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, from eight to eleven o'clock P. M.; and for Friday, December 28, an invitation to the gentlemen to attend a reception of the Penn Club from half-past nine to half-past eleven P. M.

The second joint session was held in the same place on Friday, December 28, at 10 A. M., and was devoted to the reading of papers.

The third joint session was held in the same place on Friday, December 28, at 8 P. M. It was a Memorial Meeting in honor of William Dwight Whitney.

The programmes of the joint sessions, and of the separate meetings of the societies other than the American Oriental Society, will be found below. The papers commemorative of Professor Whitney will be published in a separate volume.

Three separate sessions were held by the American Oriental Society: on Thursday, December 27, at 3.00 P. M.; on Friday, December 28, at 2.30 P. M.; and on Saturday, December 29, at 10 A. M. It has been found impossible, owing to the fact that so many members of this Society are also members of other philological associations and attended the other separate sessions, to prepare a complete list of those present at our separate sessions. A partial list follows:

Adler, Cyrus	Gilbert, H. L.	Lawler, T. B.	Steele, J. D.
Barton, G. A.	Gilman, D. C.	Levias, C.	Stratton, A. W.
Batten, L. W.	Gottheil, R. J. H.	Lyman, B. S.	Taylor, C. M.
Binney, John	Grape, J.	Lyon, D. G.	Taylor, J. P.
Bloomfield, M.	Hall, I. H.	Macdonald, D. B.	Tyler, C. M.
Briggs, C. A.	Harris, J. R.	Mead, C. M.	Van Name, A.
Buck, C. D.	Harper, R. F.	More, P. E.	Ward, W. H.
Culin, S.	Haupt, P.	Myer, Isaac	Webb, E.
Deinard, E.	Hazard, W. H.	Oertel, H.	Wheeler, B. I.
Easton, M. W.	Hilprecht, H. V.	Olcott, G. N.	White, J. W.
Elwell, L. H.	Hopkins, E. W.	Paton, L. B.	Williams, T.
Fay, E. W.	Jackson, A. V. W.	Perry, E. D.	Wright, T. F. [54]
Ferguson, H.	Jastrow, M., Jr.	Ramsay, F. P.	
Frothingham, A. L., Jr.	Lanman, C. R.	Schmidt, Nathaniel	

The minutes of the last meeting, at New York, were read by the Recording Secretary, Professor Lyon, of Harvard University, and accepted by the Society.

Reports of officers being now in order, the Corresponding Secretary, Professor Perry, of Columbia College, presented some of the correspondence of the year.

Professor E. E. Salisbury had written to thank the Society for the vote passed at its last meeting congratulating him on the near approach of his eightieth birthday.

Mr. W. E. Coleman had written in reference to the Geographical Congress, which was held in San Francisco on May 4, 1894, at which he was present as the representative of this Society. Mr. Coleman read at the Congress a paper on "Oriental Societies and Geographical Research," and he states that this paper is to be printed in one of the bulletins of the Congress.

The Corresponding Secretary read a copy of the letter which he had sent to the International Congress of Orientalists, held at Geneva, September 3-12, 1894, inviting that body to meet in this country in 1897.

He also read a letter from Prof. A. H. Edgren of the University of Nebraska, stating that he had inscribed to Prof. Whitney's memory his translation of *Shakuntala*, an advance copy of which he presents to the Society.

He also read a letter from the Honorary Philological Secretary of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, stating that he sends 20 copies of a fly-leaf exhibiting the system of transliteration which will in future be adhered to by the Asiatic Society of Bengal for all its publications.

Reports on the Geneva Congress of Orientalists being called for, Professors R. J. H. Gottheil and A. V. W. Jackson responded. The former stated that a provisional report was made at the Congress of Edward Glaser's most recent journey of discovery. Glaser brought home some 600 Sabæan inscriptions and a collection of rare Arabic MSS. The American delegates presented the invitation extended by the American Oriental Society, but the Congress finally chose Paris for the next place of meeting. Professor Jackson stated that Professors Ascoli and Weber paid fitting tributes to the memory of Professor Whitney.

No reports were presented by the Treasurer, the Librarian, or the Committee of Publication, such being due only at the annual meeting in Easter Week.

The Directors reported by their Scribe, Professor Perry, as follows :

1. That they recommended for election to Corporate Membership the following persons :

- Professor L. W. Batten, Philadelphia, Penn.
- Mr. Samuel N. Deinard, Philadelphia, Penn.
- Mr. Harry Westbrook Dunning, New Haven, Conn.
- Mr. J. A. Kohut, New York, N. Y.
- Mr. Thomas B. Lawler, Worcester, Mass.
- Professor W. Max Müller, Philadelphia, Penn.
- Professor L. B. Paton, Hartford, Conn.
- Professor Nathaniel Schmidt, Hamilton, N. Y.
- Mr. M. Victor Staley, New Haven, Conn.
- Professor Charles Mellen Tyler, Ithaca, N. Y.
- Dr. Albrecht Wirth, Chicago, Ill.

2. That they recommended that the next annual meeting be held at New Haven, on Thursday, April 18, 1895, and the following day, the Committee of Arrangements to consist of Messrs. Van Name, Salisbury, Oertel, and the Corresponding Secretary.

3. That they recommended that the report of deceased members be postponed until the April meeting.

4. That they recommended that the next issue of Proceedings shall follow the April meeting.

5. That the vacancy in the Publication Committee caused by the death of Professor Whitney had been filled by the appointment thereto of the Corresponding Secretary.

Ballot being had, the persons recommended for election to membership were declared formally elected; and the other recommendations contained in the above report were unanimously adopted by the Society.

On motion it was resolved that the minute passed at the last meeting in regard to the long and faithful services of Professor Lanman as Corresponding Secretary should be printed in the next issue of the Proceedings.

The minute is as follows :

VOTED :—That the American Oriental Society has heard with great regret that Professor Lanman feels himself obliged to decline re-election as Corresponding Secretary of this Society. With singular devotion and great faithfulness he has performed the difficult and engrossing duties of this office for the past ten years. During these years the conduct of the work of the Society has been committed especially to his hands, and to his indefatigable efficiency its success has been to a very great extent due. The Society hereby expresses its hearty thanks to him for his faithful and self-sacrificing services, and gratefully recognizes his worthy succession to the two distinguished scholars who preceded him in this office.

The Society passed a vote of thanks to the University of Pennsylvania for their hospitality, and to the Local Committee for their efficient services, which had added so greatly to the enjoyment of the members in attendance.

This vote was in the nature of an affirmation of the vote of thanks passed at the joint session of Friday, December 28, which was as follows :

The several Societies here assembled in the CONGRESS OF AMERICAN PHILOLOGISTS, viz.:

THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY,  
THE AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION,  
THE SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS,  
THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,  
THE AMERICAN DIALECT SOCIETY,  
THE SPELLING REFORM ASSOCIATION, and  
THE ARCHÆOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OF AMERICA,

unite in expressing their hearty thanks to the Provost and Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania for their unstinted hospitality ; to the Local Committee, with its efficient Chairman and Secretary, for the considerate provision made for the convenience of every guest ; and also to Dr. Horace Howard Furness for his memorable words of welcome. They further desire to record their grateful recognition of the courtesies generously extended to them and their friends by

THE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF PENNSYLVANIA,  
THE PENN CLUB,  
THE UNIVERSITY CLUB,  
THE ART CLUB,  
THE ACORN CLUB, and  
THE NEW CENTURY CLUB.

Final adjournment was had on Saturday at 11.30 A. M.

---

The following communications were presented :

1. Notes on Dyāus, Viṣṇu, Varuṇa, and Rudra, by Professor E. W. Hopkins, of Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Penn.

These notes we intended to present as the detailed verification of certain views set forth in more popular form in a volume (now in press) on Indic religions. The appearance of Oldenberg's *Religion des Veda* after we had sent the title of this paper to the committee has led us to modify the form in which the notes were first drawn up, and to extend the field which they cover to a review of the principles involved in interpretation.

First, as to Dyāus, we will simply state the grounds on which we have claimed that Dyāus was never a supreme god of the Aryans. The various Aryan families have each their own chief god, and there is no supreme Dyāus or etymologically equivalent supreme form in Teutonic\* or Slavic mythology. In Rome there is a Mars-piter as well as a Ju-piter. In India itself *pitā* is said of Dyāus no more than of other gods. Moreover, the instances where Dyāus is called father make it evident that he is not regarded as a Supreme Father but as father paired with Mother Earth. Now there is no advanced Earth-cult in the Rig-Veda. At most, one has a poem to Earth, called Mother as a matter of course; but no worship of Earth as a great divinity over the gods is found. This is just the position taken by Dyāus. He is, as the visible sky, not the Father, but one of many 'father'-gods. That he fathers gods means nothing in the hyperbolic phraseology of the Rig-Veda. The Dawn and Aṇvins are his sons ; but dawn may be sired of sky without much praise.† Indra destroys Dyāus in v. 54. 2-4, though the latter is called his father, iv. 17. 4.‡ In invocations Dyāus is grouped as one

---

\* Compare Bremer, I. F., iii. 301.

† So x. 45. 8, sky begets fire.

‡ In x. 173. 6 Indra carries Dyāus as an ornament.

of many gods (i. 129. 3; 136. 6; iii. 51. 5; 54. 2; v. 46. 3; x. 63. 10, etc.),\* or more often as one of the pair 'sky and earth' (iv. 51. 11; v. 59. 1; vi. 70. 5-6; x. 10. 5; 36. 2; 59. 7-10), 'father and mother.' But the natural sex of Dyāus as an impregnating bull (*Dyāūr vṛ'ṣā*, v. 36. 5) is not so strong but that heaven and earth are regarded also as two sisters (i. 185. 5; iii. 54. 10).† Dyāus in v. 47. 7 is mere place, the high seat, and so in other passages (iii. 6. 3; x. 8. 11). Dyāus, it is true, is called the great father, v. 71. 5 ('Fire brought great father Dyāus and rain,' *rasa*), just as it is said that 'great Dyāus' is the norm of Indra's strength (v. 57. 5. 'Dyāus Asura and earth' both bow to Indra, v. 131. 1). But how few and unimportant‡ are the cases where Dyāus is father can be estimated only when one considers how large is the work in which the few cases occur, and how many other gods are also called 'father':

'Father Dyāus be sweetness to us,' i. 90. 7.

'Dyāus is my father, my mother is the Earth,' i. 164. 33.

'Dyāus is your father, Earth is your mother,' i. 191. 6.

'Dyāus and Earth, father and mother,' v. 43. 2.

'Father Dyāus, mother Earth, brother Fire,' vi. 51. 5.

'Wind, Earth, and father Dyāus grant us place,' i. 89. 4.

'Father Dyāus give us treasure,' iv. 1. 10.

Often it is only in connection with nourishing Agni (fire) that Dyāus is lauded (vii. 7. 5; x. 8. 11; 88. 2, 8).

That to be father even of the gods is not to be a Supreme Father-God is evident from i. 69. 2: *bhūvo devānām pitā putrāḥ sūn*, 'being the son thou becamest the father of the gods,' said of Agni. Other passages which show how lightly 'father' is used are as follows:

'(Agni) is our un-aging father,' v. 4. 2.

'Thou, O Agni, art our Prometheus, our father,' i. 31. 10. §

'Thou, O Indra, art our Prometheus, and like a father,' vii. 29. 4.

So Bṛhaspati is father; and Tvaṣṭar is father; and Wind is father; and Varuṇa is father; and Yama is father; and Soma is father; and Agni is father again in two or three passages; and Indra in another is father and mother both. ||

They that claim an original supreme Aryan Father Sky must point to him on early Aryan soil or in India. They cannot do this in either case.

\* iv. 57. 3; i. 94. 16 (ix. 98. 58); iii. 54. 19 ('May sky, earth, waters, air, sun, stars, hear us'); vii. 34. 23 ('sky, earth, trees, and plants,' invoked for wealth); v. 41. 1, etc.

† Dyāus and Earth both 'wet the sacrifice,' and give food in i. 22. 13. Dyāus bellows (thunders) only in i. 31. 4 (verse 10 as 'father'); v. 58. 6; vi. 72. 3. The Maruts pour out 'the pail of Dyāus' in v. 59. 8.

‡ Scarce a touch of moral greatness exists in Dyāus. In iv. 3. 5 he is grouped with Varuṇa as a sin-regarding god, but the exception is marked.

§ Prometheus, *Prōmetēis*. In the two verses preceding, 'Dyāus and Earth' are the parents of Agni himself.

|| i. 31. 10; ii. 5. 1; viii. 98=87. 11. For the other cases see the Lexicon. Wind in x. 186. 2 is both father and brother.

There is then no evidence whatever that Dyāus in the Rig-Veda is a decadent Supreme. The testimony shows that while the Slav raised Bhaga, and the Teuton raised Wotan-Odin, the Greek raised Zeus out of a group of gods to be chief. To the Hindu Dyāus was never supreme, but only one of many 'protectors' (*pitaras*, fathers); whose 'fatherhood' is not more pronounced than is that of other gods. If Zeus-Jupiter is supreme in the Græco-Italic combination, this proves nothing for the Aryans in general. It is parallel to a supreme Slavic deity with Iranian and Indic representations who are not supreme, even as Dyāus is not supreme.

Viṣṇu: Oldenberg claims that Viṣṇu's strides are atmospheric; that the god is a space-god. But Viṣṇu has not been regarded as a sun-god through predeliction for sun-gods, but because what little is said of him answers only to that conception. It is the rule in the Rig-Veda that the spirits of the departed live in the top of the sky, and Viṣṇu is the first god to represent (what he continues to represent through later ages) the sun-home of souls.\* Earth-souls, star-souls, moon-souls, plant-souls, these are oddities, rarities in the Rig-Veda. The sun-soul is, as it is later, the norm. Viṣṇu is the Herdsman, like Helios, and in the Rig-Veda, like Sūrya and like Fire, 'the undeceived Herdsman': *viṣṇur gopā ādābhyaś*, i. 22. 18; (*agnir*) *ādabdhō gopāś*, vi. 7. 7; (*sūryo*) *jāgato gopāś*, vii. 60. 2. In ii. 1. 3 'Viṣṇu of the wide steps' and Fire are one. The fastening of the world is ascribed in the first two passages to the Universal Agni and to Viṣṇu in almost the same words. In i. 155 his highest step is most clearly in the sky. In i. 154, the 'highest *pada*' of Viṣṇu can scarcely be other than the highest place in the top of the sky.†

Oldenberg, chiefly on the strength of the one verse i. 154. 4, where Viṣṇu holds the three-fold world, is quite confident that this god is a space-god (p. 139). It is evident that this theory is built upon the ritualistic conception of Viṣṇu, rather than on that of the Rig-Veda. For *vi-kram* can scarcely mean anything else than step widely out;

---

\* i. 154. 1, 5.

† Although Viṣṇu's name occurs about forty times in the family books, as a general thing he is lauded only in hymns to Indra, whose friendly subordinate he is (iv. 18. 11; viii. 100=89. 12). He appears inconspicuously in connection with the Maruts in v. 87; ii. 34 (v. 3. 3, interpolated); viii. 20 and 40; and is named in hymns to Indra in ii. 22; vi. 17, 20, 21; viii. 3, 9, 12, 15, 66; otherwise only in a list of gods vii. 44 (as in lists of All-gods, iii. 54, 55; v. 46, 49, 50; vi. 48, 49, 50; vii. 35, 36, 39, 40; viii. 25, 27, 31, 72); in one hymn to Indra-Agni, vii. 93; in one hymn to Agni alone, iv. 3, with which deity he is identified (above); and in one hymn to the Aṅvins, viii. 35, to whom he is joined (verse 14). In viii. 29. 7 he is (not named) the wide-stepping god whose steps are where gods are. He is almost ignored in some families, notably in that of Viṣvāmitra (book iii). Among all he gets but two independent hymns, both in the collection of one family (vii. 99-100); and shares one hymn with Indra in another family book (vi. 69).



and the solar home of souls is too evidently connected with Viṣṇu to be thrust aside as of no account. To the translation of the unique, and in all probability late verse, i. 154. 4, which speaks of Viṣṇu 'supporting the threefold world,' whence Oldenberg concludes that the ritualistic idea is the normal conception of the Rig-Veda, he gives this significant note (p. 228): "Diese Vorstellung herrscht in den jüngeren Veden vor." We say that this is significant because it indicates not only the author's attitude, but a certain lack of historical sense, which detracts from the value of his work, and which we shall have occasion to notice again. Historically stated, the note should read: "This view is quite unique in the Rig-Veda, but prevails in later literature." In accordance with this later view Oldenberg translates *urugāyā* as 'lord of wide spaces,' instead of 'wide-stepping,' and ignores altogether those traits which make a solar deity of Viṣṇu. These traits, indeed, are not very pronounced, but the reason for this is the one given in our recent essay on Henotheism. Viṣṇu is no longer a natural phenomenon. He is a mystic god, the keeper of the souls of the dead, the first cover of real pantheism. Of his solar character remain the three steps, indicated by *vi-kram*, 'step widely,' one of which is located in the zenith, and the others cannot be downward or upward (which *vi-kram* would not express) but across from horizon to horizon.

Varuṇa: In the forthcoming book to which we referred above, we have directed ourselves chiefly against the interpretation of Varuṇa as a Sole Supreme, either in the Veda or at any other stage of Aryan belief. We should, therefore, be very ready to welcome any cogent interpretation of Varuṇa as nature-god more distinct than 'covering heaven.' But though we find such an interpretation in Hillebrandt and Oldenberg, we must ask what grounds make them identify Varuṇa with the moon and why, above all, should it be necessary to 'regard Varuṇa as a Semite.' The first question is answered shortly if not satisfactorily, because Sun and Moon make a natural pair, Mitra and Varuṇa. But so do heaven and sun, especially when one is informed that sun is the eye of heaven (Varuṇa). So that what little support is given to any nature-interpretation remains to uphold the Heaven-Varuṇa. But it is especially the assertion on p. 193 of Oldenberg's *Religion*: 'The Indo-European people has taken this (whole) circle of gods (Mitra, Varuṇa and the Ādityas) from elsewhere' that must be examined. The first argument is that Varuṇa is not Aryan, not the same with Ouranos; an old doubt, which is based on phonetics, always uncertain in proper names, and not even then in this case fully justified. The next argument is that since Varuṇa is moon (a bare assumption), the Indo-Europeans would have two moon-gods and two sun-gods. To this the only answer necessary is that names are not things, and that the same natural phenomenon may diverge into two distinct gods. The 'five planets' as Ādityas have of course no support save the attraction of novelty. And then follows: "Is it then not probable that the Indo-Iranians have here borrowed something which they only half understood, from a neighboring people, which knew more about the starry

heaven, in all likelihood the Semites (or the Akkadians)?" Further : "When one examines the gods of the Veda does one not receive the impression that this closed circle of light-gods separates itself as something peculiar, strange, from the other gods of the Vedic Olympus?"

And so Oldenberg, by a further series of questions, states indirectly that he regards Varuṇa as representative of an older higher culture, witness of a lively intercourse with a people that "at that time" stood before the threshold of India.

We have shown in our book that Mexico has as good and as natural a Varuṇa as had ever the Akkadians, to whose moon-hymn Oldenberg triumphantly refers as proof of his interrogations being an argument. Something of this sort has been suggested by Brunnhofer (see our paper *The Dog in the Rig-Veda*, A.J.P. xv. 158), who also wants to get rid of Varuṇa (for a different reason), and so ascribes him to Iran.

Our last quotation from Oldenberg gives, however, the key of the argument. Varuṇa is not like the other Vedic gods. Whether this be reason enough for regarding him as an exotic we shall discuss below. But first, in order to the elucidation of Varuṇa, some other divinities must be discussed. What does Oldenberg make of Dawn and Aṇvins?

The chief question in regard to Dawn is why she is not allowed to share in the *soma*. Oldenberg's answer to this is that in the later ritual she is given an hymn, but not *soma*; hence, etc. The answer that the whole tone of the Dawn hymns separates them as sharply as does those of the two great Varuṇa hymns from the later ritual is quite overlooked.

As to the Aṇvins they are to Oldenberg the morning and the evening stars. They had previously been identified with the Gemini by Weber and with Venus by Bollensen. Why are they now taken to be two disjunct stars? The proof for such a statement is offered solely in the phraseology of i. 181. 4 and v. 73. 4; of which passages the first says that the Aṇvins are 'born here and there' (*ihéha jātā*), and the second that they are *nānā jātāu*, which Oldenberg chooses to translate "getrennt geboren," though the first verse of the same hymn shows that the words mean 'in different places.' Oldenberg himself warns against taking sporadic phrases as expressive of normal Vedic ideas. Let us see what is the normal tone of the Vedic poets in regard to their twin gods. But first to review Oldenberg's argument. 1. The Aṇvins must be the (one) morning star, because only a morning star can be spoken of as accompanying dawn and sun-rise. 2. "Only the duality does not suit this idea." But "a very little change will make this all right," and so, since "the idea of a morning star cannot be separated from that of an evening star: this (evening star) is the second Aṇvin." 3. As evidence: they are said to be 'born here and there,' etc. (as above), and are praised at morn and eve.

We pause here to give a truer picture of the Aṇvins according to the Rig-Veda :

i. 157. 1: "Agni is awake, the Sun rises, Dawn shines, the two Aṇvins have yoked their car to go."

i. 180. 1: "You two Aṇvins accompany Dawn."

i. 183. 2 : "You two Aṇvins accompany Dawn."

viii. 5. 2 : "You two Aṇvins accompany Dawn."

And so on, in many cases, the Aṇvins as a pair accompany the morning light. Their united duality is a part of their being, no less pronounced than is their matutinality. But again, it is not twice, morn and eve, but thrice that they appear. In the first place they come to three *soma*-pressings (*passim*), and in the second they are represented as being in three different places. Compare viii. 8. 14 : "If ye two Aṇvins are in the distance or in air;" 22, "in many places;" 23, "Three places of the Aṇvins there are now revealed, formerly secret." Three-fold is the nature of the dual Aṇvins for this very reason (compare i. 34). 'At eve and at morn,' 'in east or in west' (x. 40. 2; viii. 10. 5), is merely part of their excursion 'round earth and heaven' (viii. 22. 5, and often); exactly as the expression 'called at morn and eve' (x. 39. 1; 40. 4, etc.) represents only a part of the three-fold calling (morn, noon, and night, v. 76. 3), 'the sky, the mountain, and the waters' are these three places (v. 76. 4). But above all they come always in union together (*ékasmīn yōge samāné* vii. 67. 8).

On the basis of this simple juxtaposition of actual verses we are constrained to think that Oldenberg's facile view is not in accordance with the extant texts. For we demand at least a little proof of the one star, a little evidence of the evening star. But what proof is offered? None other, besides what we have mentioned, save the 'parallel' of Mitra Varuṇa as sun and moon, where Varuṇa is not proved to be moon, and a further comparison of the Aṇvins' intercourse with Sūryā as the equivalent of a Lithuanian folk-song, which must itself, in order to fit into Oldenberg's interpretation of the Aṇvins, be 'interpreted' in a novel Oldenbergian way!

Rudra : But the best, and worst, example of Oldenberg's method is found in his treatment of Rudra. The hymns in Rudra's honor are very few. It is impossible that any one writing about them should overlook any significant statement. One of these statements is as plain as it is conclusive, vii. 46. 3 : 'May thy lightning which, *hurled down from the sky*, passes along the earth, avoid us.' Now what has Oldenberg to say about this celestial lightning-hurler, who is (ii. 33. 1) the father of the rain-bejeweled (v. 57. 4) storm-gods, the Maruts? "Rudra is wont to be considered a tempest-god. He cannot at any rate have this meaning in the consciousness of the Vedic poets. The hymns to the Maruts show how in the Veda the tempestuous rush of the wind is described : the lightnings flash, the rain pours down. [etc.] *Nothing of this sort is found in the Rudra hymns.*" Rudra in ii. 33. 3 is the god who "holds the *vájra* in his arms," and this *vájra* can be no other than the *didyút* 'gleaming bolt' (literally 'lightning') of vii. 46. 3, regarded also as an arrow of his bow (ii. 33. 10). And what should the leader of the rain-giving Maruts do? He does not pour the rain; he hurls the lightning. But when it is said (v. 58. 7) : 'the sons of Rudra make rain of their sweat,' is not Rudra implicated, at least as an ethereal or atmospheric god? But, to pass this point and return to the verse : (Rudra's) 'lightning hurled from the sky passes

along the earth.' How does Oldenberg, who interprets Rudra as an Old Man of the Mountains without any celestial attributes, explain this? He does not even allude to it! He wanders off to Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras to explain the 'mountain-nature' and the medicines of this lightning-god of the sky, and to interpret his bolt as wind (pp. 217 ff.), till, after one page devoted to Rudra in the Rig-Veda, and six to the later Rudra, he comes to this result: "We have before us here, I think, a relation of those European types whose nature Mannhardt has developed in so masterly a way, Fauni and Silvani, wood-men, wild people. From the desert, from mountain and wood come the sickness-spirits or darts of sickness to human abodes. These are the hosts or the shafts of Rudra, who dwells in the mountains."

We are far from denying the possibility of such an origin for much in Rudra's later nature, for Rudra in the later age is Īiva, the folk-god. But where there are but four hymns to Rudra in the Rig-Veda, and one of them (vii. 46) represents him as a celestial god, not even mentioning mountains; another praises him as 'bright as the sun, shining as gold,' also without an allusion to mountains (i. 43; 5, like sun and gold); a third calls him 'the boar of the sky' and speaks of averting celestial wrath, also without an allusion to mountains; and the fourth calls him the god 'that bears lightning in his arms' (above), and speaks of the (*jālāṣa*) cure that 'carries off the celestial hurt,' and of Rudra's storming like a wild bull, a warrior aloft upon his car (ii. 33. 7, 11), also without an allusion to mountains—in these circumstances we maintain that to represent Rudra as an original Old Man of the Mountains, portrayed in his primitive nature in later texts, and in a secondary nature in the Rig-Veda, is unhistorical.

But Oldenberg lays much stress on the 'medicines'? This, however, proves nothing to the purpose, for to the Vedic seers the waters are medicines. Because Rudra as a Marut-leader is a water-causing god, therefore he is medicinally potent. What idea is connected with the word for medicine in the Rig-Veda? Compare i. 23. 20 "all medicines are in the waters" (*apsú antár viṣvāni bheṣajā*). In i. 89. 4, Wind, Earth and Father Dyāus are besought for medicines, along with the Aṇvins. Of which gods are used the verbs 'to heal with medicine'? With one exception only, the dewy Aṇvins.\* Are these, therefore, mountain-gods as well as separated stars? If we do not err, only hyperbolic Soma, the waters, the Aṇvins, and Rudra are called 'physicians.' And if the last is 'the best physician' is it not because he is most responsible for "the waters which are the physicians" (vi. 50. 7)? Can, in any circumstances, this, the Rik view, be calmly shoved overboard and the "true interpretation" of Rudra be one based on later texts, where the earthly pest-gods of the un-Aryan peoples have crept in and coalesced with the Vedic celestial 'pest and healing' god? Does not Helios in Greece send pest and is he not a saviour too? Is it

---

\* In viii. 79=68. 2 (compare viii. 72=61. 17; x. 175. 2) Soma as priest and poet heals (*bhiṣakti*; the other verbs *bhiṣajy* and *bhiṣṇajy* are used of the Aṇvins). In vi. 74. 3 Soma and Rudra have all medicines.

more scientific to be less historical? Let us see how the Vedic poet represents sickness and healing: "O Agni, keep off enemies, destroy sickness and demons, let out for us a quantity of water from the ocean of the sky" (x. 98. 12). For not only Rudra (Lightning) but the universal Agni, Fire, "sends down rain from the sky" (ib. 10); and this whole hymn shows that the medicines against sickness are the rains. Moreover, when Wind is besought to 'bring medicine' how is it done? "Wind blow medicine hither, blow away hurt, for thou hast all medicines, and goest as the messenger of the gods . . . and may the gods bring help hither and the hosts of Maruts" (x. 137. 3, 5), for "the waters are curative, the waters drive away sickness, the waters cure everything, may they bring thee cure" (ib. 6). And that this is the regular view of the Vedic seers shows another passage: "May we be with you, O Maruts, when the water streams down health and medicine" (v. 53. 14). In viii. 20. 25 medicine is in the Indus, in the Asiknī, in the seas, and *pārvateṣu*, which, considering the preceding verse, "Maruts, bring us to your Marut-medicine," must be rather cloud than hill, and here the "Maruts, sons of Rudra," also bring cure (ib. 17. 26). What says the poet directly? "From the sky come the medicines" (x. 59. 9, *divāḥ caranti bheṣajā*). And it is only as dew-gods that the Aṣvins are physicians in the eyes of the Vedic poets: "When ye two mount your car ye wet our realm with sweet *ghee*—ye heal with your medicines" (i. 157. 2, 6). In a word, Rudra as lightning and medicine god remains a thunder-storm god in strict accordance with the dogmas of the Vedic poets. One may indulge in any speculation as to his pre-Vedic nature without affecting the Rig-Vedic conception of him; and one may interpret the later Ārva-Bhava-Īva mixture as one chooses, but the Vedic Rudra is not this conglomerate.

Having thus obtained the key to Oldenberg's method, we are in a position to understand the meaning of the interrogation in regard to Varuṇa. "Is he not a god quite different to the ritualistic gods, and consequently ought we not to condemn him as an alien, because he does not fit into our conception of the Rig-Veda?" This is what is intended. In answer we say: "Well, yes, Varuṇa in some hymns is not like the ritualistic gods, and Xenophanes' God is not like the gods of Aristophanes; but that is no reason for supposing that Xenophanes borrowed from the Akkadians."

Varuṇa has been more misrepresented than any god of the Rig-Veda. There are at least three Varuṇas, all distinct variations under the same name. The last of these is the pantheistic Varuṇa of the Atharva, who is quite other than the quasi-monotheistic god of the Rik.

The Rig-Veda contains two hymns to Varuṇa that are of exalted, almost monotheistic color. Other Varuṇa hymns represent him as a water-god chiefly, and do not give him a very lofty position. "He upsets a water-keg and makes heaven, air and earth stream with rain. The king of creation wets the ground . . .," or "Varuṇa lets the streams flow"—such traits he shares with Parjanya, and in most of the hymns to him he does just what Rudra does in another fashion, sends rain which heals from hurts (sin), though the rainy side is vigorously

suppressed by some admirers. There is quite enough of it, however, in the Rig-Veda to show that Varuṇa is like the other gods, and to nullify the force of the appeal that is meant to oust him. Varuṇa rises to a great height, but he still drips water wherever he goes, and there is no reason for making the Semites or the Akkadians responsible for him.

One last specimen of unhistorical interpretation may be given. In a burial-hymn of the Rig-Veda the dead man is addressed thus: "Enter now into Mother Earth, the earth wide and kindly. May she, a maid soft as wool, guard thee from Destruction's lap *Nirṛti* ('going out,' like *Nirvāṇa*, 'blowing out'). Open, O Earth, harm him not, be easy of access, easy of approach to this man. As a mother (covers) her son with the hem of her garment, so enfold him (open for him), O Earth." Then the pillars and props of the grave are mentioned, and a clod of earth is cast down by the speaker of the hymn. The later hymns to the Manes (shown to be late by their content) have already knowledge of cremation as well as burial; and in the later ritual-age cremation is the only rite for adults. Now Oldenberg must needs equate the Rig-Veda with the ritual, and on beginning his description of the Vedic funeral, he says (p. 570): "Cremation was the customary form of funeral though not the universal one"! In regard to the so clear allusion to burial given in the verses above he adds: "It can just as well refer to cremation" (p. 571). It certainly can be forced to refer to cremation, and that is what the later ritualists did with it in arranging the ritual (Roth, Z.D.M.G. viii. 467), but it seems a pity to adopt nowadays their point of view.

We trust that the exception which we have taken to Oldenberg's method, as exhibited in these instances, will not be accepted as a general depreciation of the clever and learned work in which that method is implicitly manifested. Especially in the latter part the book is one of great value, fruitful in reasonable suggestions and comprehensive in its elucidation of the cult. Here there is by no means so much to stickle at as in the first part, which aims at presenting the Vedic religion as a whole, without due historical distinction between the Brahmanic age and belief as these are known in extant literature and the age and belief of the Rig-Veda. For it is one thing to say that the Rig-Veda is the product of a Brahmanic age (to that we should agree with some reservations), and another to say that this Brahmanic age is the Brahmanic age of extant Brāhmaṇas. The extant Brāhmaṇas, and even the Atharva-Veda, represent a period so removed from that of the Rig-Veda that the god who in the Rig-Veda is not yet developed as chief god is in the Brāhmaṇas and Atharvan already an antiquated figure-head with whom other newer ritualistic gods are identified to ensure their respectability.

But, although the cult-part of Oldenberg's *Religion des Veda* (the radical error lurks even in the title, for there is no one religion of the Veda) is free from the grosser confusion of Brahmanic and Vedic views, to which we have called attention, there are yet several points even here which seem to demand a word of tentative criticism. For instance, we are not sure that Oldenberg is wrong and that we are right

in this regard, but to us it seems as if too much stress had been laid upon totemism. On page 85, our learned author, who is perhaps too well read in modern anthropology, seems to give the absolute dictum that animal names of persons and clans imply totemism. This is no longer a new theory. On the contrary, taken in so universal an application it is a theory already on the wane, and it seems to us injudicious to apply it at random to the Rig-Veda. As a means of explanation it requires great circumspection, as is evinced by the practice of the American Indians, among whom it is a well-known fact that animal names not of totemistic origin are given, although many of the tribes do have totem-names. For example, in the Rig-Veda, Cucumber and Tortoise certainly appear to indicate totemism. But when we hear that Mr. Cucumber was so called because of his numerous family we must remain in doubt whether this was not the real reason. Such family events are apt to receive the mocking admiration of contemporaries. Again, Mr. Tortoise is the son of Gr̥tsamada, a name smacking strongly of the sacrifice, a thoroughly priestly name, and it is not his ancestor but his son who is called Tortoise, very likely because he was slow. The descendants of this son will be called 'sons of the tortoise,' but there is no proof of totemism; on the contrary, there is here direct evidence that totemistic appearance may be found without totemism. We can scarcely believe that Gr̥tsamada's ritualistically educated son ever worshipped the tortoise.

Clearly enough, it is in the later literature that one is brought into closest rapport with the anthropological data of other peoples. This is due to the fact that the more the Hindus penetrated into India the more they absorbed the cult of the un-Aryan nations, and it is from these rather than from the refined priestliness of the Rig-Vedic Aryans that one may get parallels to the conceptions of Cis-Indic barbarians. All the more reason is there for not confounding Rig-Veda and Brāhmaṇas. A rough-and-ready jumbling of Rik and Sūtra will not, as it seems to us, be productive of any definitive results. Thus, to interpret (p. 328) the sacrifice as "big medicine" (to use the corresponding phrase of the American Indians), is in our opinion as unwise and as opposed to the notions of the Rig-Veda as it is wise and legitimate in the presentation of Brāhmanic theosophy.

The modern character of Oldenberg's work (we refer to the first part) will make it popular with anthropologists, and we may expect to hear it cited for a long time as authority for anti-solar mythologists. The more we study primitive religion, however, the more we are likely to learn that religion is not all from one seed, and that solar deities after all have existed and do exist. To convert the Vedic gods into giants and dwarfs, or cast them out of India because they refuse either to conform to the anthropological model or to adapt themselves to the Procrustean bed of the later ritual is equally unhistorical. It would be more conducive to a true view to go through the history of each god, pointing out how and where the striking differences arise, which may be seen in the earlier and later conceptions of his character.

2. The Sanskrit Root *manth-, math-* in Avestan ; by Professor A. V. Williams Jackson, of Columbia College, New York.

The Sanskrit root *manth- math-* 'to shake, agitate, cause concussion, crush, bruise,' has apparently heretofore not been quotable in the Avesta ; its existence in Avestan, however, may now be shown from one of the fragments in the Farhang Zand-Pahlavi, p. 7, ll. 6-10 (Hoshenji and Haug, *Zand-Pahlavi Glossary*, pp. 7 and 48 ; Darmesteter, *Le Zend-Avesta, traduction* iii. p. 14). The passage, though corrupt in its syntax, apparently alludes to certain penalties incurred by acts of assault and battery, or in consequence of injuries carelessly inflicted upon a corpse in moving it from the *kata* or receiving vault to the Tower of Silence. The latter suggestion is Geldner's, after Dastur Hoshenji. The text runs

*narš vaghdhanem  
astem aēvō mastravandm  
vispaca yō mastraghndm am āsta  
hvarō-cithandm aētēē anyē cikayutō.*

With due allowance for the wretched syntax, *aēvō* and the uncertain *aētēē*, this may be rendered :

'(As for) the head of a man—  
Whosoever has crushed a single bone of the skull,  
And he that has crushed all (the bones) of the skull,  
Shall pay (du.) the penalty of a wound as the others.'

Such at least is the sense one may gather from the Pahlavi version *āē vanāskār vaghtān gabrā barā sūmbēnd . . ast aēvak mastarg . . . zag hamāi zanišnō mūn mastarg dar sūft* 'if a sinner crush the head of a man—a single bone—every blow which pierces the skull.' Compare also Darmesteter *loc. cit.*

Even though the sentence-structure be faulty, the general meaning is plain, and the verb *amāsta* in the third line of the Avestan fragment contains the looked-for root. The form is an aorist mid. 3 sg., either root-aorist *a-māth-ta*, or *s-aorist a-māth-s-ta*, cf. Skt. *ātāṇsta* (√*tan* 'to stretch,') and *māṇsta*, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, 882 a. For the Avestan phonetic laws that come into consideration see Bartholomae, *Handbuch d. alteran. Dialekte*, 148 c, and Jackson, *Avesta Grammar*, I., 151, 46.

The newly-found Avestan root which here describes the injuring or crushing of the head is employed quite similarly in Sanskrit with regard to the demon Namuci slain by Indra : RV. v. 30. 8 *çīro dāsāsya nāmucer mathāyān* and RV. vi. 20. 6 *prā çyenō nā madirām añçum as-māi çīro dāsāsya nāmucer mathāyān*. Cf. also AV. vii. 50. 5, of a wolf shaking a sheep : *dvīm vṛko yāthā māthat*.



3. Two Problems in Sanskrit Grammar; by Professor Maurice Bloomfield, of the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

1. On the instrumentals in *nā* from stems in *man* (*mahinā*, *varinā*, *prathinā*, *bhūnā*, etc.).

This problem has been discussed very frequently, the previous treatments being recorded by Professor Collitz, *Bezzenberger's Beitrage*, xviii. 231 ff. There is no occasion for reviewing these here, since the present essay approaches the subject from a point of view radically different from that of the preceding attempts.

We start from *mahinā*, by far the most common of these words: it occurs 35 times in the Rig-Veda. All the occurrences are restricted to two metrical types. First, in octosyllabic pādas the word occupies the fourth, fifth and sixth syllables. There are four cases of this kind, iii. 59. 7; viii. 12. 23; 68. 3; x. 119. 8, e. g., iii. 59. 7: *abhi yó mahinā divam*.

Secondly, in the other 31 cases (for which see Grassmann) the word follows immediately upon the caesura of a triṣṭubh-jagatī-pāda, no matter whether the caesura is after the fourth or fifth syllable. The following examples may illustrate the situation:

- i. 173. 6: *prá yád itthā | mahinā nṛbhyo ásti* (triṣṭubh).
- ii. 17. 2: *çīrsāni dyāṁ | mahinā prāty amuñcata* (jagatī).
- iii. 6. 2: *divāç cit agne | mahinā prthivyaḥ* (triṣṭubh).
- vi. 68. 9: *ayāṁ yá urvī | mahinā máhivrataḥ* (jagatī).\*

Both positions are, metrically speaking, critical. The second half of octosyllabic pādas is regularly iambic (see Oldenberg, *Die Hymnen des Rig-Veda*, p. 8); the caesura in triṣṭubh-jagatī pādas is regularly followed by an anapaest (— — —) (ibid. p. 56). It is evident at once that the regular instrumental *mahimnā*, a bacchius (— — —), could not, without violating the two general metrical laws, stand in these positions, and yet the facts show that there was a marked lexical and stylistic need for such a word in that very position.†

There is one other closely related word, equally unfit for these positions in the metrical line, namely *mahnā*, occurring 34 times in the RV. This is the true metrical complement of *mahinā*.‡ It occurs either at the end of triṣṭubh lines (7 times), where the final — — is needed, e. g., RV. ii. 35. 2: *apām nāpād asuryāsyā mahnā*,§ or before the caesura in

\* Of the three cases of *mahimnā* in the RV. only one holds this position, i. 59. 7, *vaīçvānaró | mahimnā viçvāksitih*; the remaining two appear before the caesura, where they are free to stand (vi. 61. 13; x. 88. 14).

† The AV., whose diction is less hieratic and in closer contact with popular speech, whose metres are far less trammelled, reads at iv. 30. 8 (var. of RV. x. 125. 8) *etāvati | mahimnā sām babhūva*.

‡ Cf. e. g. RV. vii. 60. 10, *dákṣasya cin mahinā mṛṣatā nah*, with iii. 62. 17, *mahnā dákṣasya rājatahaḥ*. Cf. also RV. v. 87. 2\*, *prá yé jātā | mahinā yé ca nū svayām*, with the fourth pāda of the same stanza, *mahnā tād eṣām ádhṛṣṭāso nū 'drayaḥ*.

§ The remaining passages of this sort are: RV. i. 174. 4; ii. 28. 1; vi. 66. 5; viii. 100. 4; x. 55. 7; 89. 1.

all of the remaining cases, except four (ii. 3. 2; iv. 2. 1; vi. 21. 2; x. 6. 7). It is unnecessary for our purpose here to define the relations of the spondaic *mahnā* to the types prevalent in the divisions before the caesura, since these are liberal enough to accommodate any group of two syllables no matter what their quantity may be (see Oldenberg's tables, *ibid.* pp. 14, 49 ff.).

Now the form *mahnā* is an isolated instrumental,\* and we may at once permit ourselves to be struck with the peculiar fact that the 'dropping' of the *m* in *mahimnā* is also a matter which concerns the instrumental only. I assume that *mahinā* is a contaminated (blend) form of *mahnā* and *mahimnā*, instigated, or elevated to a position of prominence, by the obvious metrical and stylistic conveniences briefly sketched above.

The word *mahinā* means 'with greatness.' The former considerations of the problem have failed to take note of the semantic character of the remaining words that are involved in the discussion: *variṇā* means, 'with extent'; *prathinā*, 'with extent', and *bhūnā*, again, 'with greatness'. These are so obviously congeneric† with *mahinā* as to suggest at once that they were patterned after it. This is shown strikingly by TS. iv. 7. 2. 1 = MS. ii. 11. 2 = VS. xviii. 4, where three of these four nouns succeed each other in a liturgical formula, and that, too, not in their instrumental form, but in the nominative singular, eliminating thus the suspicion that the peculiar form of the instrumental is the cause of their appearance in company. The passage reads, *mahimā ca me varimā ca me prathimā ca me . . . yajñēna kalpantām* 'may greatness, and scope, and breadth . . . form themselves for me with the sacrifice.'

The only remaining form, *preṇā*, seems in every way out of agreement. The form occurs twice, and is taken as an instrumental from *premnā* 'love.' It is permitted, of course, to assume that by this time instrumentals in *nā* from stems in *mān* had asserted themselves unto freedom and independent initiative. But the meaning of the word is not at all certain, though Sāyaṇa at RV. x. 71. 1 explains it as equal to *preṇā* 'with Vedic loss of *m*' (*makāralopaṣ chāndasaḥ*).

We may finally note as a curiosum that the form *drāghmā*, RV. x. 70. 4, which is usually discussed in this connection as an instrumental from *drāghmān* (Sāyaṇa, *drāghimnā*) is again lexically congeneric ('with length') with the group in *nā*; a corresponding nominative *drāghmā* (MS.), *drāghimā* (VS.), and *drāghuyā* (TS.) figures in the liturgical formula excerpted above along with the other designations of extent.

\* We may perhaps assume that it represents an ancient heteroclitic declension, together with the stem *māhas* for the casus recti.

† See for this term and the linguistic principles involved our two essays *On adaptation of suffixes in congeneric classes of substantives*, *Am. Journ. Phil.*, xii. 1 ff., and *On the so-called root-determinatives in the Indo-European languages*, *Indogermanische Forschungen*, iv. 66 ff.

2. On the relation of the vowel-groups *ūr* and *ur* to *īr* and *ir* in Sanskrit.

De Saussure's theory of dissyllabic roots (*Mémoire sur le système primitif des voyelles*, pp. 239 ff.) has yielded the result that the Sanskrit vowel-groups *īr* (before consonants) and *ir* (before vowels) are now generally, though not universally, regarded as the reduced, low-tone, forms, (I. E.  $\bar{r}$ ) corresponding to SK. *ārī* (I. E.  $\acute{er}2^*$ ). Thus the root-forms *tīr* in *tīr-tvā*, and *tir* in *tir-āti* are regarded as weak form of the dissyllabic root *tarī* in *tarī-tum*, precisely as *kṛ* in *kṛ-tvā* is the weak form of *kar* in *kār-tum*. De Saussure, *ibid.* p. 244, has also hinted at the correct explanation of the groups *ūr* and *ur*, and it is the object of these lines to present the subject in clearer outline, and to illustrate it by additional materials.

First of all we must eliminate one source of the groups *ūr* and *ur*. The groups *īr* and *ir* never occur after labials when they represent I. E.  $\bar{r}$ : only *ūr* and *ur* are found. Thus the desiderative which has for some reason generalized the long reduced vowels  $\bar{i}$ ,  $\bar{u}$ ,  $\bar{ir}$ , and  $\bar{ur}$  never exhibits *īr* after a labial. A root beginning with a non-labial may exhibit either *īr* or *ūr* (*titūrṣati* and *tātūrṣati*), a root beginning with a labial can have only *ūr*, not *īr* (*bubhūrṣati* from *bhr̥* 'carry'); cf. Joh. Schmidt, *Vocalismus*, ii. 229. The forms *ūr* and *ur*, in roots beginning with labials are, therefore, otiose as far as their labial coloring is concerned; they may be = *īr* and *ir*, labialized by the initial consonant. On the other hand, the presence of the labial initial may be fortuitous, and the labial color of *ūr* and *ur* may be organic, just as in roots that do not show the labial: each case must be judged by itself. Aside from labializing influences the Sk. groups *ūr* and *ur* are the reduced vowel-forms (I. E.  $\bar{r}†$ ), occurring respectively before consonants and vowels, of the strong forms Sk. *ārū* (I. E.  $\acute{er}ū$ ). This may be stated in the following proportion:

$$\bar{u}r \text{ and } ur : \acute{ar}ū = \bar{i}r \text{ and } ir : \acute{ar}ī. ‡$$

\* Perhaps also  $\acute{er}2$ ; see the author in *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, xlviii, p. 578.

† One may suppose that this lingual vowel was accompanied by some rounding of the lips even in proethnic times.

‡ There is a marked difference between the strong types  $\acute{ar}ū$  and  $\acute{ar}ī$ . The former occurs before vowels in the form *ārv*; the type  $\acute{ar}ī$  never occurs before vowels in the form *āry*; instead the monosyllabic *ar* appears. Thus the Avestan stem *ta<sup>u</sup>rv-aya* by the side of SK. *taru-te*, but there is no *tary-* anywhere to match *tarī-tum*, *tari-tar*, etc. The varying quantity of the *u* of  $\acute{ar}ū$  is interesting, because it shows that the long  $\bar{u}$  of *arī* is not of an origin radically different from that of the  $\bar{u}$  of *arī*, and is not the root-determinative  $\bar{u}$  (I. E.  $\bar{u}$ ) which has crowded out  $\bar{i}$  (I. E.  $\bar{e}$ ). Thus in reference to Brugmann, *Grundriss* ii, pp. 896, 931; cf. our remarks Z.D.M.G. xlviii. 578. From what source, or what style of root-determinative can *tārū-śas* (by the side of *tāru-śa*), *varū-tār* and *varūtha*, *jārūtha*, etc., have derived their  $\bar{u}$ ? Unless we assume purely metrical lengthening we are compelled to acknowledge both  $\acute{ar}ū$  and  $\acute{ar}ī$  as I. E. types,  $\acute{er}ū$  and  $\acute{er}ī$ . This is, of course equally true of  $\acute{an}ī$  (=I. E.  $\acute{an}ā$ ), etc.

The history of these vocalic relations may be illustrated by the following list :

1. *tárũ-,tarv-*: *tūr, tur* 'pass.'

The base *taru* occurs in the verbal forms, Vedic *taru-te, taru-ṣema, táru-ṣante*. This is the anteconsonantal form. The antevocalic form is *tarv-* in Avestan *ta<sup>u</sup>rvaya* 'overcome' (e.g. *ta<sup>u</sup>rv-ayeni*, Yasht xiv.4). Nominal forms are numerous: *táru-s, táru-ṣa, taru-tar, táru-tra*, perhaps also, *táru, táru-ṇa* and *tárũ-ṣas*. Further, *tsáru-*, if the root *tsar* is a contamination of *tar* and *sar*, as I have assumed (*Indogermanische Forschungen*, iv. 72).<sup>\*</sup> The reduced forms, ante-consonantal *viçva-tár(ṣ)*, *su-pra-tūr(ṣ)*, *tūr-tá, tūr-ṇá, viçvá-tūr-ti, -tūr-ya, tá-tur-ṣati, tár-ṇi*; ante-vocalic *tur-áti, tur-áte, tár-tur-āṇa, (ap-) tūr-am, tūr-a, turá-ṇa, tur-i, tá-tur-i, tar-tur-a*.

Cf. the dissyllabic base in *ĩ*: *-tarĩ-tar, tarĩ-ṣāni, tarĩ-tum* with the reduced forms, anteconsonantal *tĩr-ṇá, tĩr-tvā, ti-tĩr-ṣa*, and antevocalic *tĩr-áti, ti-tĩr-us, -tĩr-am, -tĩr-e*, etc. The materials, of themselves, yield the proportion :

*tarũ (tarv)*: *tūr, tur* = *tarĩ*: *tĩr, tĩr*.

2. *járũ, jarv*: *jūr, jur* 'waste, grow old.'

The Rig-Veda has *járũtha* 'waste', as the name of a personified force, destroyed by Agni (cf. his epithet *a-jĩrá* 'not wasting away'†); see RV. vii. i. 7; 9. 6; x. 80. 3. The antevocalic strong form appears in Avestan *za<sup>u</sup>rv-ā* 'old age'; cf. *zrv-an* 'time'.‡ The anteconsonantal weak form in *jār-yati, jūr-ṇá, jūr-ṇi*, and *amā-jūr(ṣ)* 'aging at home'. The antevocalic weak form in *jur-áti, já-gur-i, a-jūr-am*. Cf. with this *jari-mán*: *jĩr-ṇá*. The weak antevocalic form perhaps in *a-jĩr-á* (see above). Again we may state the proportion :

*járũ*: *jūr, jur* = *jari*: *jĩr, jĩr*.

3. *çáru, çarv*: *çūr* 'crush'.

The strong anteconsonantal *çáru-s* 'missile'; antevocalic *çarv-d*, Avestan *sa<sup>u</sup>rv-a* 'god of destruction'. The weak anteconsonantal form *çūr-tá* (RV. i. 174. 6) 'slain'. Cf. on the other hand the infinitive *çári-tos* with *çĩr-ṇá* and *çĩr-tá*.

4. *caru, carv*: *cūr* 'grind'.

This root presents the relation very clearly. Anteconsonantal strong *carú-s* 'porridge'; antevocalic *cárv-ati, carv-ayati* 'grind, chew'. The

<sup>\*</sup> Cf. *τερό-σκεται· νοσεῖ, φθίνει. τερό-σκετο· ἐρείπετο* (Hesych).

† The word is ordinarily, but doubtfully, compared with Lat. *agilis* 'agile', and derived from the root *aj* 'drive'.

‡ Cf. also Greek *γαῦ-s* (Attic), *γηῦ-s* (Ionic), *γηῦ-s* (poetic), as evidence of *u* in the second syllable.

weak form in *cūr-ṇa* 'ground, flour'. The congeneric root *bharv*, in *bharv-ati* 'chew', Avestan *aš-bo<sup>u</sup>rv-a* 'eating much', is in some way related to this root, but no weak forms of the root occur.\*

5. *karu, karv* : *kūr, kur* 'make'.

The strong forms of the verb *karó-mi* are built upon a base *karó-* which is in direct relation to *karu* in *karú-ṇa* 'deed'. The antevocalic strong form in *kārv-ara* 'deed'. The weak anteconsonantal form in *turi-kūr-mi*, *-kūr-min* 'acting mightily'; the antevocalic perhaps in *kuru* 'make thou'.† Vedic *kṛ-n-ó-mi*, *kṛ-ṇ-u-té* also point to a dissyllabic base ending in *u*.

6. *paru, parv* : *pūr, pur* 'fill'.

Whitney in his *Roots of the Sanskrit Language*, p. 100, treats under root 1 *pr* the words *pāru-s* and *pārv-an* 'knot, joint' (cf. *pārvata*, Avestan *pa<sup>u</sup>rvata*, 'mountain'). This etymology is none too certain, because Greek *πεῖραρ* *πέπατος* (*peru<sup>o</sup>-tos*), and *ἀπείρων*† exhibit European *r* and the root for 'fill' has I. E. *l*. These words doubtless represent an I. E. base *péru*. But we have I. E. *pélu* in Gothic *filu* which is related, along with its strong base *filau* (genitive *filau-s*) to Sk. *purú*, Greek *πολύ*, as Sk. *karu* (*karv*) with its strengthened base *karo* is to *kuru*. Avestan *po<sup>u</sup>ru*, Achemenidan *parūv* may also be referred to I. E. *pelu* (Goth. *filu*).§ The weak anteconsonantal base in *pūr-dhi*, *pūr-nd*, *pūr-tá*, etc.; the weak antevocalic base in *á-pū-pur-am*, *pá-pur-i*, infinitive *-pur-as*, etc. But we must not fail to note that the dissyllabic base with ordinary sh'va in *pārī-man* may have a share in these weak forms, since the labial initial seems to prevent the occurrence of the weak stems *\*pīr*, *\*pīr*.

7. *varū* (I. E. *yerū*) : *ūr, ur* 'cover, protect'.

The strong stem in *vārū-tar* 'protector', *vārū-īha* 'protection', and perhaps *vāru-ṇa* 'covering sky'.‖ Further in Avestan *vo<sup>u</sup>ru* 'broad', i. e. Aryan *vāru* (cf. *vohu* = Sk. *vasu*). The form is very interesting in the light of the present discussion, since it manifests the same relation

\* There seems to be a vein of lexical adaptation in the *u* of the second syllable in the direction of the meaning 'destroy'. See all the preceding numbers, and cf. our article *On the root-determinatives*, in *Indogermanische Forschungen*, iv. 66 ff.

† I do not divide *kur-u*, because the form is an especial weak manifestation of *karu*. Perhaps originally barytone *kāru*: oxytone *kūrú*: low tone *kūr*. We shall meet with this type again below.

‡ Cf. also *paru-t* 'in the past year', and *parut-tna* 'pertaining to the past year'. The forms are reported by the grammarians, and are as yet not quotable. They are, however, not to be questioned, because of *πέπυτι* (*πέπυσι*) 'a year ago'.

§ Cf. our explanation of Avestan *vo<sup>u</sup>ru* in the next number.

‖ Greek *ἑρπύσθαι* 'protect', *ἑρπύμα* 'protection' also exhibit the strong stem.

between itself (I. E. *uēru*) and Sk. *urú*, as between Gothic *filu*, and perhaps also Avestan *po<sup>u</sup>ru* (I. E. *pēlu*), and Sk. *purú*, Greek *πολύ*. The weak anteconsonantal stem in *ūr-ṇōti* 'cover', *ūr-vá* 'reservoir'; the weak antevocalic form, perhaps in *ūr-as* 'breast'. The type *urú*: *vāru* = *kuru*: *karu* = *puru*: *paru* (Goth. *filu*), etc. The dissyllabic types with *sh'va*, *varīman*, *varītum*, etc., suggest the same caution as in the preceding group, because of the initial labial.

8. *varu* (I. E. *uēlu*): *ūr*, *ur* 'surround, turn'.

An apparently kindred I. E. root-word *uēlu* in the sense of 'surround, cover, turn' is bound up with Sk. *varū*, because the latter fails to differentiate *r* and *l*. Latin *volv-o*, Goth. *valv-jan* 'roll'; Greek *ἔλν* in *ἔλν-σθην* (Il. xxiii. 393), *ἔλν-σθείς* (Od. ix. 433) 'roll, compress', *ἔλν-τρον* 'cover'. It is obviously impossible to decide in each particular case of Sk. *varū* whether it represents I. e. *uēru* or *uēlu*. So e. g. *ūr-ṇoti* may be from either. But the anteconsonantal weak form *ūr* in *ūr-ṇā* 'wool' belongs to *uēlu*, as is attested by the European words for 'wool'; the antevocalic weak type may be assumed in *ūr-aṇa* 'ram', and further *úlba* (*úlva*), Lat. *vulv-a* shows a base *ulu-* on a level with *kuru*, *purú* and *urú* (cf. also *gurú*).

9. *dharu*: *dhūr*, *dhur* 'hold.'

The strong type in *dharú-ṇa* 'holding'; the weak ante-consonantal type in *dhūr-śú*, loc. plur. of *dhur* 'wagon-pole,' the ante-vocalic type in acc. sing. *dhúr-am*.

In addition to the types that show the presence of *u* treated above under *tāru*, namely *tārū* (*tarv*), *tūr*, and *tur*, there are other types which have in some way arisen as modifications of the same original dissyllabic base. They are *tūrv* in *tārū-ati* 'overcome' and *tvar* 'hasten.' Similarly *jūrv* 'consume' and *jvar* (*jval*) 'burn.' Now there is a root in the sense of 'injure' which correspondingly exhibits the following types: *dhūrv* in *dhūrū-ati*, *dhvar* in *dhvār-ati*, by the side of *dhūr* in *dhūr-ta* 'robber,' and *dhur-ā* 'forcibly,' ÇB. x. 5. 2. 12 (quoted also by Whitney, *Roots*, etc., p. 87. top, from the MS.). These forms combined point forcibly to a dissyllabic mother-base *dharu*. We may best realize this by the following proportion:

*tarū* (*tarv*): *tūr*, *tur*: *tūrv*: *tvar*=*jarū* (*jarv*): *jūr*, *jur*: *jūrv*: *jvar*=*x*:  
*dhūr*, *dhur*: *dhūrv*: *dhvar*.

Here *x* is *dharu*, and we are thus led to a real etymon for the last series: *dhūr*, etc. must have meant originally 'to hold by force.' The etymologist should, moreover, not fail to take note of the congeneric meaning of *tūrv*, *jūrv*, and *dhūrv*; the grammarian may well be appalled by

the protean variety of these types, and the apparently hopeless task of coördinating them.\*

10. (*saru*): *sūr* 'move.'

The perf. pass. partic. *a-sūr-ta* 'untrodden, remote' occurs in this indubitable meaning at AV. x. 3. 9; cf. *sūr-ta* and *a-sūr-ta*, RV. x. 82. 4, and Pāṇini viii. 2. 61 (*sūr-ta* = *ṣṛ-ta*). Further *sūr-mī* 'water-pipe'; *sūr-myā* 'located in canals.' The dissyllabic stem *sāru* is wanting (*sarī* in *sārī-man*), but the root *sru* 'flow' is so evidently a modification of I. E. *séru* (cf. *dhru-ti*, type 7 in the foot-note, above), as to justify us in speaking of *sūr-ta* as a participle from the root \**saru*. The parallel root *ṣru* is equally an early development of I. E. *kēlu*; the full root is apparent in *κελεύω* 'to make hear, to order,' which seems to stand on the same morphological plane with Sk. *karó*, except that it appears in a thematic form (cf. *ταύω*: Sk. *tanu-té*).

11. *maru*: *mūr*, *mur* 'die.'

Nothing is coercive in this number. The perf. pass. partic. *mūr-ṇa* 'crushed' goes with the secondary root *mṛṇ*, but its long vowel points to a dissyllabic strong stem. The antevocalic weak type in *mur-īya*. Weber, *Indische Studien* iv. 398, and Whitney, *Roots*, etc., p. 24, derive *maru* 'desert' from the root *mṛ* 'die,' and this may represent the strong dissyllabic type. The secondary root *mūr-ch* 'thicken' which forms a participle *mūr-tá* and the abstract *mūr-ti* 'form' may possibly claim a place in this company, but its etymological relations are complicated and obscure.

The weak stems *gūr*, *gur* 'greet' in *gūr-tá*, *gur-dte*, etc. are wanting in any kind of a strong stem, directly connected with them.† Similarly the root *hvr* 'be crooked' exhibits the forms *ju-hūr-thās*, *ju-hur-anta*, *hvdár-ate* and *hru-ti* which suggest forcibly the proportion:

*dhūr-tá*: *dhur-á*:*dhvdár-ati*: *dhru-ti* = *ju-hūr-thās*: *ju-hur-anta*:  
*hvdár-ate*: *hru-ti*.

This points to an original type \**haru* (see No. 9, and the note there). Deficient in strong correlative types are also *jár-gur-āna* and *jal-gul-as*: root *gr* 'swallow'; *bhur-ántu*, *bhūr-ṇi*, and *bhurv-ṇi* (type *xurv-*, as in *turv-án*, *ulv-á*): root *bhur* 'quiver'; cf. Lat. *serv-eo*. It is of interest to

\* We may profitably resume here all the basic forms which seem to be descended from dissyllabic *zarū*, *x* being the varying initial consonant: 1. *xarū* (*taru-te*, *tarū-šas*, etc.). 2. *xarv* (*ta<sup>ur</sup>v-aya*, *za<sup>ur</sup>v-a*, *ṣarv-á*, etc.). 3. *xūr* (*tūr-tá*, etc.). 4. *xur* (*tur-áti*, etc.). 5. *xuru* (*kuru*, *purá*, etc.). 6. *xurv-* (*ulv-a*, *turv-án*, etc.). 7. *xru* (*zrv-an*, *dhru-ti* 'injury,' etc.). 8. *xruv* (*dhruv-á* 'firm'). 9. *xūrv* (*dhūrv-ati*, *jūrv-ati*, *tūrv-ati*). 10. *xvar* (*jvár-ati*, *tvár-ati*, *tvár-ati*, *dhvdár-ati*). I am tempted to pervert: 'he who reads may run.'—Avestan *zrv-an* may belong rather to type 8 (= *zruv-an*), than to type 7.

† Cf. perhaps Gr. *ᾠπύω* 'sing' in relation to *jari-tár* 'singer,' *gīr-bhās* 'with songs.'

glance over the list under the suffix *vāni* Whitney, *Sk. Gr.*<sup>2</sup> § 1170<sup>b</sup>. Seven examples are given, but five of them are *turv-āni*, *bhurv-āni*, *da-dhr̥ṣv-āni* (*θρασῖ-ς*, *dhr̥ṣ-n-u-te*), *tu-turv-āni*, and *ju-gurv-āni*. Nominal suffixes beginning with *v* makes a very feeble showing in the light of the theory of dissyllabic types in *u*. Cf. also *daghv-an* : *dagh-n-u-yāt*; *pruṣv-ā* : *pruṣ-n-u-te*; *tākv-an* : *tāku*, etc. Conversely there need be little doubt that the dissyllabic strong stem *aru* in *ārv-ant*, *ārv-an*, and Avestan *a<sup>u</sup>rv-a* is a type on the same morphological plane with the preceding, though the weak forms *ūr*, *ur* do not happen to occur. The stem *aru*: *r-n-ō-ti*=stem *karu*: *kṛ-n-ō-ti*=stem \**dharṣu* (*θρασῖ-ς*=\**dhr̥ṣū*): *dhr̥ṣ-n-ō-ti*, etc.

When the group *ūr* is followed by a consonant the morphological antecedents of the types are generally wanting. Thus *mūrdhan* (cf. Av. *ka-mereda*), *bhūrja*, *sphūrg-ati*, *kūrd-ati* (*gūrd* : see J.A.O.S. xi., p. cxlvii), *ūrj*, *ūrdhvā*, etc.

The solitary form *spūrdhān* from *spr̥dh* (cf. Avestan 6th class stem *spereda-*) shows a labial before *ūr*, as do several other of these, and is therefore of doubtful value. If we compare *cūḍā* 'crest' with *κόρυ-δο-ς* 'crested lark'\* we may assume for it the value \**cūr-dā*. The ablaut relation of *cūḍā* : *κόρυ-δος* would then be parallel to that of *ῥπ-ρος* : Sk. *śvdp-nas*. Similarly von Bradke, *Kuhn's Zeitschrift* xxxiv. 157, would explain Sk. *kūṭā* (\**kūl-tā*) 'without horns' upon the basis *kālu* in Lat. *calv-os* 'bald' (cf. Sk. *kulv-a*).

#### 4. Description of a Collection of Arabic, Coptic, and Carshooni MSS. belonging to Dr. Cyrus Adler; by Prof. Henri Hyvernät, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

The MSS. briefly described in the following list are the property of Dr. Cyrus Adler, of Washington, and were purchased by him in Egypt in 1891. They formed a single collection and were secured from the widow of a Coptic priest. All of them were written in Egypt for the use of the Coptic Church. While none of them is of great antiquity, several are careful and correct specimens of chirography, and would hold an honorable rank in the collections of Europe. Such is, for instance, No. I, a Bible in Arabic from Genesis to II Chronicles inclusive, written in the year 1276 of the Coptic era or 1560 A. D., as appears from an interesting note of the copyist. No. 6, containing the Acts and the Epistles, must be of the same date; it begins with a preface on the life and epistles of St. Paul and sums up the sections, chapters and verses, and also gives an index of quotations from the Old Testament in the Epistles of St. Paul. No. 13 is a very good MS., containing the lives of Barlaam and Josaphat; the date was not found, but I think it can be ascribed to the XIVth Century. It would be worth while to compare it with the other copies of that famous work in the libraries of Europe.

\* For other noun-stems built up on the stem *keru*, *koru*, see Vani<sup>Cek</sup> *Griechisch-Lateinisches Wörterbuch*, p. 126; Persson, *Wurzelerweiterung*, p. 222.



Among the Coptic MSS. may be named No. 15, containing the Gospel of St. Mark in the Memphitic or Bahiric dialect ; although not much older than the XVIth Century, it represents a good classical school from a palæographical point of view, and also a good recension. On the last folio there is an interesting cryptographical note of the copyist, which I translate thus : For God's sake remember your servant Gabriel who wrote this second Gospel.

The catalogue contains 24 numbers. The 24th is not Christian. It is the first part of the work of Ibn Chalikkan, in Arabic from ا to ض.

I sincerely hope that the Oriental Society will not further delay in the compilation of a general catalogue of all the Oriental MSS. in the public or private libraries of America. I am very willing to do my share of the work, by cataloguing all the Coptic and Christian Arabic MSS. I have myself from 75 to 80 Oriental MSS., Arabic, Turkish, Persian, Syriac and Armenian, and will be glad to send them to whosoever will volunteer to catalogue them.

The following is a list of the MSS.:

No. 1. The Bible in Arabic. Genesis to II Chronicles inclusive. Two volumes in one ; very good MS., neatly written and well preserved ; contains interesting note of the copyist on the last folio of each volume, especially of the second volume ; original binding 11½ inches long, 8½ inches wide. Folios, vol. i, 162 ; vol. ii, 193 ; 22 lines on page. Date 1276 Coptic era—1560 A. D.

No. 2. The Four Gospels in Arabic ; complete. Pretty good MS., mutilated in places ; supplemented by a recent rough hand ; chapters marked in Coptic letters ; 4½ inches long, 3½ inches wide. Folios not numbered regularly ; by count 272 ; 9 to 15 lines on a page. 1508 Coptic era—1792 A. D. Date found at the end of St. Luke.

No. 3. St. Mark in Arabic. II-12 to XVI-14 ; inexperienced hand ; careless in places ; 5 inches long, 3 inches wide. Folios not numbered, by count 96 ; 10 lines on a page. Date not found—recent.

No. 4. St. Luke in Arabic ; complete. Different hand-writings ; all of them poor and rough. 5½ inches long, 4½ inches wide ; 9 to 12 lines on a page. Folios not numbered, by count 125. Date not found—recent.

No. 5. St. John in Arabic ; complete except last verse ; hand very ordinary but regular ; chapters not numbered and not marked except last chapter ; 5 inches long ; 3½ inches wide. Folios not numbered, by count 79 ; 9 lines on a page. Date not found—recent.

No. 6. Epistles and Acts, in Arabic ; complete except last 5½ verses of Acts ; good hand, regular ; chapters not marked in text ; supplemented in places at a rather early date ; front page supplemented by another hand at a later period. Preface on the life and epistles of St. Paul, together with an index of sections, chapters, verses, and an index of quotations from the Old Testament in the Epistles of St. Paul ; 10 inches long ; 7½ inches wide, Folios 181 ; 15 lines on a page ; date not found, about XVI Century.

No. 7. Epistles and Acts, in Arabic ; from XXV-21 to end of Acts wanting ; fine broad hand ; uniform ; preface like in No. 6, but first

three folios wanting ; 8½ inches long, 6 inches wide. Folios 259 ; 15 lines on a page. Date not found, about XVII Century.

No. 8. Epistles of St. Paul in Arabic ; complete. Neat but rather awkward hand ; chapters marked in full in text ; sections in margin. In beginning, usual preface on the life and epistles of St. Paul, but first folios wanting ; at end is index of sections, chapters, etc., and also of quotations from the Old Testament ; 6½ inches long, 4½ inches wide. Folios 202, 15 lines on a page. Date not found ; not earlier than XVIII Century.\*

No. 9. Lessons from the Bible for Holy Week, in Arabic ; complete. Hasty hand ; bound ; supplemented in places at a later period ; 8½ inches long, 6 inches wide. Folio not numbered, by count 140 ; 17 lines on a page. Date not found, not older than XVIII Century. Compare Biblioth. Nat. No. 113.

No. 10. Portions of Psalms to be sung at morning and evening prayers or at Mass during the months of Thoth, Hathor, Koiak, Taubeh, Emshir, and on the fifth Sunday of the month when there is one—in Arabic. First seven months wanting. Very ordinary and unimportant ; 6 inches long, 3½ inches wide. Folios not numbered, by count 44 ; 12 lines on a page. Date not found—quite recent.

No. 11. Hymns in honor of the Blessed Virgin and of Saints, in Arabic. Clear but hasty hand ; text interspersed with illustrations of saints ; somewhat worn ; 6½ inches long, 4½ inches wide. Folios 174, the first three wanting ; 9 lines on a page. Date 1461 of Martyrdon —1745 A. D.

No. 12. Calendar or abridged Martyrology for Coptic Church, in Arabic. Neat hand ; complete ; 6½ inches long, 4½ inches wide. Folios not numbered, by count 29 ; 12 lines on a page. Date not found—recent.

No. 13. Lives of Barlaam and Josaphat, in Arabic, complete. Neat regular hand but not elegant. Oriental binding, good MSS., 8½ inches long, 5½ inches wide. Folios 269 ; last three added at later period ; 14 lines on a page. Date not found, XV Century or older.

No. 14. Portions of the Bible to be chanted in the office of Holy Week, in Coptic-Bahiric ; complete. Pretty good hand for the time ; title in Arabic ; well preserved ; 8½ inches long ; 6½ inches wide. Folios 42 ; 12 lines on a page. Date not found, about XVIII Century.

No. 15. St. Mark in Coptic-Bahiric. First five verses wanting ; Arabic translation added on first few folios. Good, regular, classical hand, suffered much from usage. Chapters and sections marked in margin ; at folio 147 a new hand of later date. On reverse of last folio, beside the title "Gospel by St. Mark" is a note of the scribe in cipher "For the sake of God remember your servant Gabriel who wrote this second Gospel ;" 9½ inches long, 6½ inches wide. Folios 153,—folios 1, 2, 48, 111 wanting. 15, 16, 17 lines on a page. Date not found, about XVI Century.

---

\* For these last three MSS. compare Biblioth. Nation. MSS. Arab., Nos. 63, 64, 65, 66.

No. 16. The Theotokia, in Coptic-Bahiric. Hymns, chiefly in honor of the Blessed Virgin, of the martyrs and of other saints. Folios 2, 3 and 4 wanting. Decadence, titles in Arabic; headings of chapters decorated with scrolls of flower and open twine, combined with most absurd figures of animals; binding wanting; 8½ inches long, 6½ inches wide. Folios 155, numbered except last three; 17 lines on a page. Date not found, about XVII Century.

No. 17. Prayer Book, in Coptic-Bahiric, with Arabic translation. Two parts—1. The Angelic praise to be sung after the Gospel of St. John, at morning prayer. 2. Prayers of midnight. Complete. Uniform; at end is a subscription of the copyist, an inhabitant of Cairo; 6½ inches long, 4½ inches wide. Folios not numbered, by count 34. Number of lines on a page varies. Date not found, XIX Century.

No. 18. Fragments of Gospel of St. John in Coptic-Memphitic, with Arabic translation; 10½ inches long, 7½ inches wide. Folios 2; about XVIII Century.

No. 19. Psalmody or collection of Acrostic Hymns and anthems in Coptic-Bahiric with Arabic translation. Complete; very rude hand, index in Arabic prefixed at later date; name of author in note, Razek Joseph Reshide; worn; 8½ inches long, 6 inches wide. Folios 277, marked in Coptic letters; 15 lines on a page. Date in note by the copyist at the end, 1552 of Martyrs—1836 A. D.

No. 20. Fragment of a Diaconicum or book which contains the prayers to be recited at Mass by the deacon, in Arabic and Carshooni; 7½ inches long, 5½ inches wide. Folios not numbered, by count 8; 16 lines on a page. Date not found—recent.

No. 21. Fragment of Gospel in Arabic and Carshooni, Matt. XII-39—XIII-46; 6½ inches long, 4½ inches wide. Folios not numbered; by count 8; 16 lines on a page. Date not found, about XVIII Century.

No. 22. Fragment of Gospel, in Arabic and Carshooni, Matt. XII-32—XVI-4; 6½ inches long, 4½ inches wide. Folios 20; 16 lines on a page. Date not found, about XVIII Century.

No. 23. Fragment of Gospel in Arabic and Carshooni, Matt. I-1 to Mark II-7; 6½ inches long, 4½ inches wide; folios 140; 16 lines on a page. Date not found, XVII Century.

No. 24. Lives of famous men, by Ibn Chalikkan, in Arabic. From |—ف; clean, clear hand, not elegant; Oriental binding, 10½ inches long, 7½ inches wide. Folios not numbered, by count 166; 21 lines on a page. Date not found, XIII or XIV Century.

5. The Emphatic Particle ֿ in the Old Testament; by Dr. I. M. Casanowicz, of the U. S. National Museum, Washington, D. C.

It is a well-known fact that the prefix ֿ is used in some passages of the Old Testament to emphasize a noun; and that classical Hebrew likewise employs ֿ-ֿ in the meaning 'whether-or,' *sive-sive* or *et-et*; and ֿֿ, after a preceding series or enumeration, to sum up, 'every,

all.' In the past, ל in these cases has been commonly regarded by exegetes and grammarians as a variety of the preposition ל in its meaning 'as to,' *quod attinet ad, quoad*. Professor Haupt, in a paper read before the American Oriental Society, April 22, 1892,\* pointed out that we have here to do with a special emphatic particle in Hebrew, ל being the Hebrew equivalent of the Arabic *la*† and Assyrian *lû*,‡ 'verily'; ל-ל = Assyrian *lû-lû (lî-lî)*§, which is a compound of *û* or *ô*, the Assyrian equivalent of Hebrew אן, and the emphatic ל; while ל in לל is a variety of the same emphatic particle ל. In illustration of this view Professor Haupt quoted the following passages: Gen. ix. 10, xxiii. 10; Ex. xxvii. 3, 19; Josh. xvii. 16; Ezek. xlv. 9; Eccl. ix. 4; Ezr. i. 11; II Chr. vii. 21.

In view of the importance of Professor Haupt's statement for Hebrew syntax, I prepared, after reading the Old Testament, the following list of the passages in which ל has apparently one of these three meanings:

### I. ל, 'verily.'

1. Ps. lxxxix. 19. כִּי לַיהוָה מִגִּנְנוֹ וּלְקֹדֶשׁ יִשְׁבְּאֵל מַלְכֵנוּ, 'for verily|| Jhvh is our shield, and the Holy One of Israel is our king.'¶

2. Eccl. ix. 4. כִּי לַכֶּלֶב חַי הוּא טוֹב מִן הָאֲרִיָּה הַמֵּת, 'for verily a living dog is better than a dead lion.'\*\*

3. II Chr. vii. 21. וְהַבַּיִת הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר הָיָה עָלָיו לְכָל עֶבֶר עָלָיו יֵשׁ, 'and this house which was exalted, verily every one that passeth it will be appalled at it.'††

\* An abstract of this paper has been published in the Johns Hopkins University Circulars, vol. xiii, no. 114, p. 107f., under the title, *A New Hebrew Particle*.

† Cf. Caspari-Müller<sup>5</sup>, pp. 242, 339, 340, 342, 394.

‡ Cf. Delitzsch, *Assyrian Grammar*, § 78, p. 214; § 93, p. 258; and § 145, p. 353.

§ Cf. Delitzsch, *l. c.* § 82, p. 230.

|| In a good literary translation the emphatic particles would, of course, ordinarily be omitted, and the emphasis expressed by intonation; they are inserted here to bring out the point under discussion.

¶ The ל is commonly considered in this passage as the preposition of the possessor, and the verse rendered, 'For Jhvh's is our shield, and to the Holy One of Israel belongs our king.' But it is only in the succeeding part of the psalm that the human king is spoken of; in all the preceding verses Jhvh is the subject. Hitzig renders the second hemistich, 'und der Heilige Israels (was den anlangt, der) ist unser König.'

\*\* The ל here is authenticated by Symmachus's rendering, *καὶ ὁ ζῶντι βέλτιον ἐστὶν ἢ λέοντι τεθνηκῶτι*.

†† Cf. the parallel passage in I Kings ix. 8, with Haupt's conjectural emendation of the text in both passages, in the Abstract mentioned above, p. 108.

II. ל-ל, *sive-sive*.

4. Lev. vii. 26 (P). וכל דם לא תאכלו בכל מושבתיכם לעוף, ולבהמה  
'and ye shall eat no manner of blood, *whether* it be of fowl  
or of beast, in any of your dwellings.'

5. Lev. xxii. 18 (P). איש איש מבית ישראל . . . אשר יקריב, 'whosoever of the house of  
Israel . . . offereth his oblation, *whether* it be any of their vows or of  
their freewill offerings.'

6. Num. xxix. 39 (P). אלה תעשו ליהוה במועדיכם לבר  
מנדריכם ונדרתיכם לעלתיכם ולמנחתיכם ולנמיכם  
'these ye shall offer unto Jhvh in your feasts, beside your  
vows and your free-will offerings, (with regard to) your burnt offer-  
ings, and your meal offerings, and your poured-out offerings, and your  
peace offerings.'

7. Josh. xvii. 16. ורכב ברזל בכל הכנעני הישב בארץ העמק  
'and all the  
Canaanites that dwell in the land of the valley have iron chariots, both  
they who are of Beth-shean and her towns, and they who are of the  
valley of Jezreel.'

8. I Kings vi. 30. ואת קרקע הבית צפה זהב לפנימה ולחיצון  
'and he overlaid the floor of the house with gold, both within and  
without.'

9. I Kings x. 23. ויגדל המלך שלמה מכל מלכי הארץ לעשר  
'and King Solomon excelled all the kings of the earth, both  
in riches and in wisdom.'

10. II Kings xviii. 24 (Is. xxxvi. 9). ותבטח לך על מצרים לרכב  
'and thou hast put thy trust in Egypt, both for chariots  
and for horsemen.'

11. Ezr. i. 11. כל כלים לזהב ולכסף, 'all the vessels, both silver  
and gold.'

12. II Chr. xxi. 3. ויתן להם אביהם מתנות רבות לכסף ולזהב  
'and their father gave them great gifts, silver as well as  
gold and precious things.'

III. לכל, 'in short, every.'

13. Gen. ix. 9, 10 (P). ואני הנני מקים את בריתי אתכם ואת  
זרעכם אחריכם: ואת כל נפש החיה אשר אתכם בעוף  
בבהמה ובכל חית הארץ אתכם מכל יוצאי התבה לכל חית

הָאָרֶץ, 'and I, behold, I am establishing my covenant with you and with your offspring after you; and with every living being that is with you, the fowl, the cattle, and every beast of the earth with you; of all that come out of the ark, *in short*, every beast of the earth.'\*

14. Gen. xxiii. 10 (P). יַעֲנֶה עֶפְרוֹן הַחִתִּי אֶת אַבְרָהָם בְּאוֹנֵי בְנֵי, 'and Ephron the Hittite answered Abraham in the audience of the Hittites, of all those who entered the gate of his town.'†

15. Ex. xxvii. 3 (P). וַעֲשֵׂת סִירְתִּי לְדִשְׁנִי וְעֵינִי וּמִזְרְקָתִי, 'and thou shalt make its pots to take away its ashes, and its shovels, and its sprinkling-basins, and its flesh-hooks, and its fire-pans, in short, all its vessels shalt thou make of brass.'

16. Ex. xxvii. 18, 19 (P). וְאֲדָנִיהֶם נְחֹשֶׁת: לְכָל כְּלֵי הַמִּשְׁכָּן, 'and their sockets shall be of brass. In short, all the instruments of the tabernacle in all its service, and all its pins, and the pins of the court, shall be of brass.'

17. Lev. xi. 42 (P). כָּל הַחֹרֶץ עַל גִּחֹן וְכָל הַחֹרֶץ עַל אַרְבַּע, 'whatsoever goeth on the belly, and whatsoever goeth upon all fours, and all that hath many feet, in short, all creeping things that creep upon the earth—they ye shall not eat.' LXX. ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἑρπετοῖς τοῖς ἐρπονσιν κ. τ. λ. = בְּכָל.

\* Delitzsch, *ad loc.*: 'Erst בְּ der Teile, in welchen das Ganze besteht, dann מִן des *genus ex quo* d. i. des Allgemeinen, unter das das Einzelne sich subsumirt, hierauf לְ des Gesamtbegriffs, wonach sich das darunter befasste Einzelne bestimmt.' This explanation seems rather strained; לְכָל חַיַּת הָאָרֶץ is superfluous, and is probably a later addition; it is omitted by the LXX.

† Here 'בְּנֵי חַת' could also be taken as an exegetical limitation of 'בְּנֵי חַת', 'as many of them as used to enter the gate of his town,' i. e. those who were his immediate neighbors. In vs. 18 בְּ is used in the same phrase, on which J. H. Michaelis in his edition (1720) observes: Pro בְּכָל habet לְכָל 3. sed contra Mas. impressam ad v. 10.

18. Num. xviii 8 (P). ואני הנה נתתי לך את משמרת תרומתי. 'and I, behold, I have given thee the charge of my heave offerings, even of all the hallowed things of the Israelites.' LXX. ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἡγιασμένων κ. τ. λ. = מן.

19. Ezek. xlii. 5. שים לבך וראה בעיניך ובאזניך שמע את כל אשר אני מדבר אתך לכל חקות בית יהוה ולכל תורתו. 'mark well, and behold with thine eyes, and hear with thine ears all that I say unto thee, in short, all the ordinances of the house and all the law thereof.'

20. Ezek. xlii. 9. כל בן נכר ערל לב וערל בשר לא יבוא אל מקדשי לכל בן נכר אשר בתוך בני ישראל. 'no alien, uncircumcised in heart and uncircumcised in flesh, shall come into my sanctuary, in short, no alien who is in the midst of Israel.' LXX. ἐν πασιν υἱοῖς ἀλλογενῶν κ. τ. λ.

21. Ezr. i. 5. ויקומו ראשי האבות ליהודה ובנימין והכהנים והלויים לכל העיר האלהים את רוחו לעלות לבנות את בית יהוה. 'then rose up the heads of the houses of Judah and Benjamin, and the priests and Levites, in short, all whose spirit God had stirred up to return and to build the house of Jhvh.'

22. Ezr. vii. 28. ועלי הטה חסד לפני המלך ויועציו ולכל שרי המלך הגבורים. 'and He hath extended mercy unto me before the king and his counsellors, in short, before all the mighty princes of the king.'

23. I Chr. vi. 34. ואהרן ובניו מקטירים על מזבח העולה ועל מזבח הקטרת לכל מלאכת קדש הקדשים. 'and Aaron and his sons were offering on the altar of the burnt offering, and on the altar of incense, in short, (they attended) to all the work of the most holy place.'

24. I Chr. xxviii. 21. והנה מחלקות הכהנים והלויים לכל עבודת בית האלהים ועמך בכל מלאכה לכל נָרִיב בַּחֲמָה. 'and, behold, there are the divisions of the priests and Levites for all the service of the house of God, indeed, there will be with thee in all kind of work every willing man that is skillful, and the princes and all the people will be entirely at thy command.'

25. II Chr. v. 12. והלויים המשררים לְכָלם לאסף להימן לידתון. 'and the Levites who were singers, they all, namely Asaph, Heman, Jeduthun, and their sons and brethren, arrayed in byssus . . .'

APPENDIX.

Passages in which either corruption of the text may be suspected or the ל admits a different explanation:—

Is. xxxii. 1. הן לצדק ימלך-מלך ולשרים למשפט ישרו , 'behold, a king will reign in righteousness, and princes will rule in judgment.'—Here ל is rejected by most modern commentators as a mistake, though it is supported by Symmachus's rendering, *ἰδὸν εἰς δικαιοσύνην βασιλεύσει βασιλεὺς*, and emphasis would be here quite in place.

In Ps. xvi. 3, לקדשים אשר בארץ המה, the ל may be dependent on אמרת in vs. 2; cf. Delitzsch *in loc.*, and Haupt in the Abstract mentioned above.

In I Chr. iii. 2, השלשי לאבשלום בן מעכה, I Chr. vii. 1, ולבני אהרן מחלקותם, and I Chr. xxiv. 1, ולבני יושבר תולע וגו', the ל is evidently due to a copyist's error; see Haupt *l. c.*

In the following passages the ל may be explained as introducing the accusative, a use which is common in Aramaic:—Job v. 2, כי לאייל

י'הרג כעש ופתה תמית קנאה, 'for vexation killeth the foolish man, and jealousy slayeth the silly man.'

I Chr. xvi. 37. ויניח שם לפני ארון ברית יהוה לאסף ולאחיו, 'and he left there before the ark of the covenant of Jhvh, Asaph and his brethren.'

II Chr. xxxi. 2. ויעמד יחזקיהו את מחלקות הכהנים והלויים על מחלקתם איש כפי עבדתו לכהנים וללויים לעלה ולשלמים,

'and Hezekiah installed the divisions of the priests and Levites in their divisions, every man according to his service, the priests and Levites, for burnt offerings and peace offerings.'

In II Chr. xxviii. 15, וינהלום בחמרים לכל כושל, 'and they carried them on asses, every one that was feeble,' ל is best explained as the exponent of the accusative.

Not counting the passages in which either the authenticity or the meaning of the ל is doubtful, there have been found three cases of the emphatic particle ל 'verily'; nine cases of ל-ל equivalent to *sive-sive*; and thirteen cases of לכל 'in short.' Of these twenty-five cases, twenty-one occur in post-exilic writers; the nine passages from the Pentateuch all occurring in portions assigned to the Priest's Code (P). This is quite in keeping with what is generally observed in languages in their decline, viz., that they multiply external means of expressing emphasis.



6. Some Epithets of Agni; by Professor E. W. Fay, Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va.

I have suggested (Proc. Am. Phil. Assoc., 1894, p. xi) that one of the descriptions of Agni in the Vedas, viz: *Apām nápāt*, 'Waters' son,' is repeated in Lat. Nept-unus (<\**ud-nos*) 'son of water,' and, less literally, in Ποτιδάων (for \**Ne-pot-idāων*) 'son of the \**idās*, \**idā* being interpreted as something like 'kindlings,' 'fuel.' I accounted for the aphaeresis in Greek by a completer personification in consequence of which there was a shift of conception from 'son of the \**idās*' to 'lord of the *idās*.' I failed to explain F in Corinthian Ποτε(ι)δάωνι; this, if not merely orthographic, may be explained as belonging to the suffix -von, °*idāFov*- being interpreted as 'possessing fuel.' I do not claim cogency, however, for the supposition that Ποτ- is for \**Ne-pot*, nor does my interpretation of °*idāων* reach probability.

We can, however, from other mythological sources largely augment the probability of my comparison.

#### 1) *Nārā-çāṇsa*.

The epithet *Nārā-çāṇsa* is separable in the Rig Veda (x. 64. 3), though only the last part is inflected. In *Nṛpetṣ* we have the dualic nom. in *ēu* (Sk. *Nārā*=*Nārāu*) converted into a stem and inflected. For the genesis of these dualic forms I refer to my Agglutination etc., (A.J.P. xv, 430). The only phonetic difficulty in identifying *Nārā*- with *Nṛpetṣ* is the variant quantity of the stem-vowel. All will admit, I take it, the probability that *Nṛpetṣ* may have been originally but an epithet of Ποτιδάων.

Not only was the epithet *nārāçāṇsa* separable, but there was a distinct divinity *Çāṇsa* in the Vedas. He was associated with *Bhāga*, and *Bhāga* with *Pūṣan* (cf. Grassmann, Wört. s. v.). The compound epithet *Nārāçāṇsa* is used of *Pūṣan* as well as of Agni, and we may infer that *Çāṇsa* is one of the forms of Agni-Pūṣan.

In Latin *Consus*, the phonetic equation with *Çāṇsa* is perfect, and the mythological sphere is the same, for *Consus* is, according to Livy (i. 9. 6), *Neptunus Equester*.

#### 2) *Agni-Mātariçvan*.

The Rishis had etymologized on this epithet quite early; thus we read in RV. iii. 29. 11<sup>ed</sup>. *mātariçvā yád amimīta mātāri vātāsya sárgo abhavat sárīmani*: 'When *Mātariçvā* roared in his mother he became a gust of wind, to howl.' Here I have referred *amimīta* to *ṽmā* 'bellow,' and defined *sárīmani* after *Sárasvati* 'goddess of the voice' (cf. Lat. *sermo* 'speech'); *amimīta* has, however, been taken heretofore in the sense 'was fashioned,' and *mātariçvan* understood as \**mātāri-çvan* 'growing in his mother.' The accent of the compound demands, however, a division *mātar-içvan* with its first member meaning 'roaring' or 'mother.' If the epithet belongs to Agni as lightning then it might mean something like 'possessing a mother-*\*içva*-' or 'with a roaring *\*içva*-' and this *\*içva*- might have a sense like *apām*

in *Apām Nápāt*, that is to say 'water' or 'cloud'; thus the compound would mean 'possessing water as a mother' or 'having a roaring-cloud,' either being quite apt epithets of the lightning.

No stem \**çva-* 'water' is extant in Sanskrit, and so, if this signification is to be justified, it will be necessary to have recourse to the kindred languages.

Because of the mythological association of the water-deities *Apām Nápāt*, Poseidon and Neptune with the creation of the horse, I suggested (Proc. Am. Phil. Assoc., 1894, p. xi) a primitive confusion of the kindred stems *akwa-* 'water' and *ekwe-* 'horse,' uniting in a still more primitive \**akw* (cf. A.J.P. xv, 425). Sibree in the Academy (Nos. 1018, 1052) had made the same suggestion, though this was quite unknown to me. Inasmuch as the vocalization of *ἵππος* 'horse' is abnormal in Greek, it is possible there was a *ἵππη* 'water.' Thus Sibree interprets *Ἀγανίππη* as 'great-spring,' *Μελανίππιον* as 'little black-water' and *Euhippa* as 'fair-water.' This seems to me more reasonable than an interpretation as 'Great-horse,' etc. Homer offers, I believe, a quite certain case of *ἵππη* 'water' in Δ 500: ὅς οἱ Ἀβυδόθεν ἤλθε παρ' ἵππων ὠκείων. 'He came to him from Abydos, from beside the swift waters,' an interpretation far more cogent, in my opinion, than 'from beside the swift mares.'

The sense of 'water' seems also to belong to Sk. *çva-*. Not to take account of Sibree's Sanskrit and Avestan names of rivers, I cite RV. viii. 26. 24:

*tvām hi supśárástomam nṛśádaneṣu hūmáhe grāvānam náçvapṛṣṭham mañhāna*

Ludwig translates with forced literalness: "dich den überreichen an trefflicher nahrung, rufen zu der menschen sitzen wir, der wie ein stein von rossrückenbreite an reichlichkeit." Grassmann renders the third pada "Dem steine gleich, der reichlich scharfen Soma trägt"—a translation got by correcting *náçvapṛṣṭham* to *náçúpṛṣṭham*. Grassmann's translation seems to me absolutely correct, and we can reach it without a textual correction if the stem *çva* be taken to mean 'fluid.' This it does also in the name of the *açvatthá* tree which was either regarded directly as a source of Soma (RV. I. 135. 8), or used for making a vat for the Soma. The *açvatthá* ('*figus religiosa*') was, like all the figs, rich in sap, and *caoutchouc* is made from it in modern times (Encyc. Brit.<sup>9</sup>, s. v. fig). As to its formation, I would explain *-ttha* thus; *-ttha* (ptc. of *√dā*): *√dā = ttha*: *√dhā*, and so *açva-tthá* would mean 'having water as its gift,' i. e. 'furnishing water.' The accent is, however, the less usual one for appositional compounds, and so it may be best to take it as a *tatpuruṣa*, 'furnished with water.'

It seems to me that both in Sanskrit and Greek the words for 'horse' and 'water' have kept hand in hand, even to showing the same abnormal vocalization in Greek. So far as the stem *ekwe-* 'horse' is concerned, the Greek abnormality may be stated as an interchange of *ē* and *ī*, and is to be ascribed, in my opinion, to an Aryan doublet *ē|ī*

(cf. A.J.P. xvi, 5ff.). Thus we might have in Sanskrit a doublet \**icva-* || *ācva-*, and in *-icvan* of our compound I would see a haplologic \**mātariçva-van* 'possessing a roaring water.' Another explanation would be to assume a stem \**mātariçva-* extended by *-n-* on the analogy of *ātharvan*, etc.

### 3) *Tānū-nāpāt*.

This epithet of Agni is traditionally explained as 'self-son.' There is a difficulty with the accent, however, for *tanū* 'self' is oxytone. Further, the double accent suggests a dvandva. I interpret *tānū-* as 'thunder' (√*(s)tan*). It is not preserved in the Veda as simplex, but the suffix *-u-* is found in *tanayitnū*, *tanyatū*, *tanyū* and *standthu*; the inferred \**tānu-* is warranted by Lat. *tonus*=*tonitrus* (Seneca, Q. N. ii. 56: *antiqui autem tonitrum dixerunt aut tonum*), for this *tonus* can hardly be the borrowed *τόνος*, which has no such signification in Greek.

I interpret the compound as 'thunder and lightning'; for *nāpāt* as short for *apām nāpāt* I refer to RV. ii. 35. 14<sup>c</sup> and to x. 15. 3<sup>b</sup> (?).

### 4) THE NUMERAL GODS.

The Vedic fire-god Agni, if not an actual derivative of √*āj* 'lead,' was liable to such a popular association. Hence we can explain his epithet *purōhita-* 'set before' (RV. i. 1. 1); he is also known as *prathama-jā* 'first-born' (RV. x. 5. 7; 61. 19), though not the exclusive possessor of this epithet. We may therefore infer that *Πρωτεύς*, which is a by-name of Poseidon, harks back to the primitive period for its meaning. In Latin *Portunus* (suffix from *Neptūnus*), usually explained as 'harbor-god,' we have the self-same name.

We have further in the Veda a numeral divinity *Tritā Āptyā* (<\**ṛ̥pt-yo-* : *napāt* 'lightning'?) where *Āpt-yā* is usually interpreted as 'son of the waters.' Now Poseidon's wife was *Ἀμφι-τρίτη* and their son was *Τρίτων*; in the battle of Zeus with the giants he rendered great service by blowing on a conch. This suggests identification with the 'thunder' which might very naturally be termed 'son of lightning.' In *Τρίτων* we have, I believe, a reduplicated form of √*tan* 'thunder' in reverse order to Lat. *ton-i-tr-u-*. Its precise Aryan form can not be constructed from the material surviving, for already in the Aryan period association with *tri-tó* 'third' had taken place, suggested doubtless by Agni as 'first.' In the Greek forms, *i* doubtless belonged to the original reduplicating syllable, cf. the Sk. intensive doublet *var-i-vṛt* || *varvṛt*. For the interchange of *r* and *n* in reduplication a good example is Grk. *καρ-κίν-ος* by the side of Lat. *can-cer* 'crab.'

In Sanskrit a *Dvītā-* 'second' stands beside *Tritā-* 'third.' In the Old Norse mythology Odhin has the epithets *Thridhi* 'third,' and *Tveggi* 'second.' It is probable, therefore, that all this numeral toying took place in the primitive period.

7. A Description of the Būlāq Edition of the *Jamhara Ash'ār al-'Arab*, with an Examination into the Origin and Sources of the Collection; by Professor D. B. Macdonald, Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Ct.\*

It is some ten years since Hommel drew attention to the *Jamhara Ash'ār al-'Arab* in his Prolegomena to a new Arabic Lexicon, read before the Sixth Oriental Congress at Leyden<sup>1</sup>. Previously, the book had been used and referred to by Nöldeke in his *Beiträge*<sup>2</sup>, and by Ahlwardt in his *Six Divans*<sup>3</sup>, besides descriptions, more or less incomplete, in different catalogues of manuscripts<sup>4</sup>.

Hommel gave a description of the book and a careful list of the poems contained in it, and promised to publish it on the basis of all the European manuscripts. That promise has not yet been fulfilled, and the present Būlāq print is, therefore, the *editio princeps*. A description of this edition and a consideration of the origin and sources of the collection is the object of the present paper.

As the Transactions of the Leyden Oriental Congress, in which Hommel gave his list of the poems, are generally accessible, and the present recension agrees essentially with that list, it will not be necessary here to go into detail<sup>5</sup>. I need only say that the book consists of forty-nine *Qaṣīdas*, seven groups of seven each, the first group being what we now know as the *Mu'allaqāt*.

The Būlāq edition is a quarto of 4+196 pages, clearly printed on good paper. There are no vowels except on p. 57-93, gatherings 8-12, in which the verses are partly vowelled. Why these five sheets should be excepted, I cannot guess. The title-page is dated, The *Amīriya* Press, Būlāq, 1308; but the date in the colophon is the latter part of *Ṣafar*, 1311. This difference will be explained immediately. The first page is blank; then come three pages of *Fihrist*, the title-page, and a page with the *Muqaddima* of the editor. He names himself Sa'īd Effendī b. 'Antūn 'Ammūn, and says that his attention had been called to the *Jamhara* by Count Carlo de Landberg, and that at his instance he had resolved to edit it. The preface is tolerably concise in style, but involved and obscure in expression. A wordy colophon by Muḥammad al-Ḥusaynī comes on p. 193-195. He explains that after the work had been interrupted by the death of the editor, it was taken up and finished by Iskandar 'Ammūn, his brother. No hint is given at what point the break in the editorship took place, or what manuscripts were used. He only complains of their fewness and badness. As in the numerous marginal notes 'a manuscript' is spoken of, and 'another manuscript,' there were at least three; but they were apparently not all complete, and thus the number available at different points varied. At one point there was only one, for the note occurs: "Thus in the

---

\* This paper had finally left the author's hands before the appearance of Professor Nöldeke's notes on the *Ḡamharat aṣ'ār al-'Arab* in Z.D.M.G. xlix. 1895, p. 290-293.—*Ed.*

manuscript which is in our hands; but it is very corrupt (*saqima*), so correct it." But the manuscripts seem to have been used faithfully, for on p. 114, at the poem of 'Urwa b. al-Ward, there is a note to the effect that in the *Majmū' ad-Dawāwīn*<sup>8</sup> there are two additional verses at that point. On the next page a various reading is noted, and the editors confess that the *Jamhara* reading which they print contradicts the lexicons accessible to them, but add: "And we seek refuge with God from falsifying." Again, on p. 137 there is the remark: "Alqama stands here in the manuscripts; but according to the *Qāmūs* and the *Aghānī* and the rest it was 'Alas." There are many other notes, but these will indicate the tolerably reliable character of the editing. A curious misarrangement may be noticed. In the list of poets according to their classes which is given on p. 35, 'Antara b. 'Amr b. ash-Shaddād comes rightly second in the second class. But the poem itself stands immediately after that of Tarafa, and is treated as an eighth *Mu'allaga*, thus leaving only six poems in the second class. This is probably due to the manuscripts; the poem of 'Antara in question became his *Mu'allaga*-poem when he was reckoned among the *Mu'allaga*-poets. As to the manuscripts which *may* have been used in this edition, I can give little information. In the Khedival Library in Cairo there are, apparently, two. In *Qism i, Juz'* iv. of the Catalogue, p. 224, one is described very briefly, with name of another and beginning of text exactly as in this edition. There is added: "And of what is mentioned in this book are the forty-nine *Mu'allagāt* (!), divided into seven divisions, each division of seven poems, designated by a designation peculiar to them. A MS. in two vols. in an ancient hand<sup>1</sup>." The author is said to have died A. H. 170; but after the forty-nine *Mu'allagāt* we need not pay much attention to that, and the date will be shown later to be absolutely impossible. Then in *Juz'* vii. p. 192, *Majmū'* 141, 1, there is another copy. In the beginning of the text quoted is a various reading *عنهم* <sup>عن العرب</sup> (p. 3, l. 8 of the printed text.)

To return to the description of the book, pages 1-39 are taken up with a long introduction. It begins: "This is the Book of the Collection of the Poems of the Arabs in the time of the Ignorance and of al-Islām, according to whose tongue the Qur'ān was revealed, and from whose words the Arabic language is derived, and from whose poems are taken the witnesses for the meanings of the Qur'ān and the obscure usages of tradition, and to whom are referred wisdom and the polite sciences, composed by Abū Zayd Muḥammad b. Abī-l-Khaṭṭāb al-Qurashī. And since no one has been found of the poets after them who has not been driven to steal from the beauties of their expressions; and since a knowledge of them on that account suffices; and further, since they are the mighty ones of poetry<sup>8</sup>, who wade its sea and whose ambition in it is far-reaching, and they made for it a Record (*Dīwān*) in which the advantages derived from them are many,—and if it were not that the language is common to all, verily they would have appropriated it from all others,—therefore we took from their poems, since

they are the source, the most brilliant and most important of them. And we make mention in this our book of what the stories handed down and the poems preserved bring from them, and of what of their words agrees with the Qur'ān, and of what is handed down by tradition from the Prophet of God concerning poetry and poets, and of what comes from his Companions and from those who followed after them, and of what each one of them has praised, and who first spoke poetry, and what is preserved of the poetry of Jinn."

The programme sketched in the last lines is closely adhered to. The next seven pages are occupied with illustrations of the value of the poets as interpreters of the Qur'ān. Then comes a page or two on the question of the first poet, followed by several pages of anecdotes from the Prophet and his Companions, relating what they said and thought of poetry. Then (p. 16, foot) begins the perennial discussion concerning the most poetical of mankind, and the claims of Imr al-Qays are upheld. This passes into eerie stories of the Jinn; how they made poetry, appeared to human beings in the desert, and inspired the Arab poets with their verses. Then, in succession (p. 24-34), the claims of Zuhayr, an-Nābigha adh-Dhubyānī, al-A'shā, Labīd, 'Amr b. Kulthūm, and ʿArafā are set forth. At the foot of p. 34 begins a general consideration of the Classes (*Ṭabaqāt*) of the poets, and statement of the arrangement of this particular selection. But this important part of the volume must be taken up from another side, and I would pass to it through an examination of the date of the compiler and the nature of his sources.

The name of the compiler of this collection, or its editor and annotator, as the case may be, is given in his preface as Abū Zayd Muḥammad b. Abī-l-Khaṭṭāb al-Qurashī<sup>9</sup>. At the foot of p. 10, he seems to refer to himself with a *qāla Muḥammadun*. These are all the references that I can find in the book; and outside of the book there is not a trace of such a person to be found. Hommel's suggestion, that he may be the Muḥammad b. Ziyād al-Qurashī who is named in an *Isnād* in the *Kitāb al-Aghānī*<sup>10</sup>, can hardly be accepted, as his position in the *Isnād* would bring him much too early. For his date, then, and date of the collection we are driven to an examination of the *Isnāds* that occur in the book. But first, it may be noted that according to the British Museum Catalogue<sup>11</sup>, the *Jamhara* is quoted by Ibn Rashīq al-Qayrawānī, who died A. H. 463; and that it is not mentioned in the *Fihrist*, which appears to reach down to A. H. 400. The first date gives a *terminus ad quem*, though, of course, we cannot say that the second gives the *terminus a quo*. Still, in a work professedly bibliographical, such as the *Fihrist*, the entire absence of any allusion to the *Jamhara* would be strange.

Among the names which stand last in the *Isnāds*, the four principal ones are Abū 'Ubayda Ma'mar b. al-Muthannā (full name, p. 12; generally Abū 'Ubayda); Muḥammad b. 'Uthmān al-Ja'farī; Abū-l-'Abbās al-Warrāq al-Kātib; and al-Mufaḍḍal. As to Abū 'Ubayda, there cannot be any doubt. He is the well known grammarian<sup>12</sup>, who was

born A. H. 114, and died A. H. 208, 209, 210 or 211—traditions vary. The *Isnāds* which contain him are the following: p. 19, Sunayd (?), from Hizām b. Artāh, from Abū 'Ubayda, from Abū Bakr al-Muzanī; p. 25, Abū 'Ubayda, from Abū 'Abd ar-Raḥmān al-Ghassānī, from Sharik b. al-Aswad; p. 25, Abū 'Ubayda, from ash-Sha'bī<sup>13</sup> [but on the margin from another MS., Sunayd, from Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Jahmī<sup>14</sup>, of Jahm b. Hudhayfa, from Abū 'Ubayda, from Abū-l-Mukhashshī (?) and Mujālid<sup>15</sup>, from ash-Sha'bī]; p. 26, Abū 'Ubayda, from Qutayba b. Shabīb b. al-'Awwām b. Zuhayr; p. 29, al-Jahmī, from Abū 'Ubayda, from Abū 'Ubayda, from Abū 'Amr b. al-'Alā<sup>16</sup>; p. 35, Abū 'Ubayda, from Abū 'Amr b. al-'Alā; pp. 24, 34, 35 are simple references to statements of Abū 'Ubayda, without *Isnāds*. It will be noticed that between Abū Zayd and Abū 'Ubayda two links come in twice. One of these, al-Jahmī, was a contemporary of the Khalifa al-Mutawakkil, A. H. 232-247.

As to Muḥammad b. 'Uthmān, I can only make one suggestion: he *may* be the Abū Ja'far b. 'Uthmān b. Abū Shayba al-'Absī of the *Fihrist*<sup>17</sup>, who died A. H. 297. But in the *Jamhara* the name is al-Ja'farī; though that may be through confusion with his *Kunya*. Further, of his books, the *Fihrist* only mentions one, *Kitāb as-Sunan fī-l-Figh*. His *Isnāds* are: from al-Ḥasan b. Dā'ūd al-Ja'farī, from Ibn 'Ā'isha at-Taymī<sup>18</sup>; p. 13, from 'Abd ar-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad, from al-Haytham b. 'Adī<sup>19</sup>, from Mujālid, from ash-Sha'bī; p. 14, from Muṭarrif al-Kinānī<sup>20</sup>, from Ibn Da'b<sup>21</sup>, from Abū Lihzim al-'Anbarī, from ash-Sha'bī; same p., from Sa'īd b. al-Musayyab<sup>22</sup>; p. 15, from Ibn Ishāq<sup>23</sup>, from 'Abd Allāh b. aṭ-Ṭufayl, from his father, from his grandfather; p. 25, from Abū Misma', from Ibn Da'b; p. 26, from Muṭarrif al-Kinānī, from Ibn Da'b; p. 27, from Abū 'Alqama, from Mufālij (?) b. Sulaymān, from 'Abd al-'Azīz b. 'Abd ar-Raḥmān b. Zayd, from 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, from Ḥassān b. Thābit; p. 32, from 'Alī b. Ṭāhir adh-Dhuhlī. As Ibn 'Ā'isha died A. H. 228 and al-Haytham in 209, and as Muṭarrif was probably the Qāḍī of Ṣana', who died about 191 (the two intermediaries I cannot fix), it is evident that A. H. 297 is not an impossible late date for our Muḥammad b. 'Uthmān.

Abū-l-'Abbās, also, is hard to fix. The *Kunya* is common and was borne, among others, by al-Mubarrad (d. 285), Tha'lab, (d. 291), the elder al-Mufaḍḍal aḍ-Ḍabbī (d. 170). But he is further distinguished as al-Warrāq al-Kātib. The title al-Kātib is very common, but that of al-Warrāq is not. In Ibn Khallikān I can find only three to whom it is given; the well known author of the *Fihrist*, an Abū-l-Ḥasan Muḥammad without date, and an 'Umar<sup>24</sup> contemporary with Abū Nuwās, who died A. H. 195 or 196. The *Kunya* of the last may have been Abū-l-'Abbās, and that is all we can say<sup>25</sup>. But it was the *Kunya* of the grammarian al-Aḥwal; and in the *Fihrist*<sup>26</sup> he is described as *Nāsikh* (scribe), and by Ḥājī Khalifa as *Muḥarrir* (correct scribe or corrector). From the *Fihrist* we learn that he edited (*'amala*) the poems of Dhū-Rumma and Imr al-Qays. Wüstenfeld suggests that his date probably fell between the end of the second and the middle of the third centuries of the Flight.

In the *Jamhara*, Abū-l-'Abbās has the following *Isnāds*: p. 12, Abū Talḥa Mūsā b. 'Abd Allāh al-Khuzā'ī, from Bakr b. Sulaymān, from Muḥammad b. Ishāq, from Hishām b. 'Urwa, from his father, from 'Abd Allāh b. Zam'a b. al-Aswad b. al-Muṭṭalib; p. 13, from Abū Talḥa, from Bakr b. Sulaymān, going back to 'Abd Allāh b. Mas'ūd; p. 16, from Mūsā b. 'Abd Allāh, from Abū 'Ubayda; p. 17, in the text stands, "Ibn al-Marwazī said, There related to me my father"; but on the margin there is as the reading of some manuscripts: "And there related to us Abū-l-'Abbās al-Warrāq, from Abū Talḥa Mūsā b. 'Abd Allāh az-Zarūdī; there related to me my father." This last is almost certainly right; for it is a first-hand story of Bedawī life and of how the Jinn made poetry and inspired the Arab poets, and with such a 'man of Merv' could have nothing to do. Further, towards the end, occurs the phrase *qāla az-Zarūdī*, and in the middle of the story comes: "Then I became old and weak and remained in Zarūd"<sup>21</sup>. The strange *nisba* az-Zarūdī, which is not in as-Suyūṭī's *Lubb al-Lubāb*, seems to have caused the difficulty<sup>28</sup>.

Last comes al-Mufaḍḍal. On page 3 he is named al-Mufaḍḍal b. Muḥammad aḍ-Ḍabbī; and on p. 10, Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Mufaḍḍal b. 'Abd Allāh al-Muḥabbārī. Elsewhere he is simply al-Mufaḍḍal. Nöldeke, who used the Berlin manuscript of the *Jamhara* (Cod. Sprenger 1215), seems to have understood al-Mufaḍḍal aḍ-Ḍabbī the elder, who died in 170. Hommel, who had access to all the European manuscripts, takes explicitly the same view. But if this edition is to count as evidence, there are insuperable difficulties in the way. In early Arabic literary history two al-Mufaḍḍals are known. The one was Abū-l-'Abbās [or Abū 'Abd ar-Raḥmān, or Abū Muḥammad] al-Mufaḍḍal b. Muḥammad b. Ya'lā b. 'Āmir b. Sālim b. ar-Rammād aḍ-Ḍabbī, of the stem Tha'laba b. as-Sīd b. Ḍabba. He was the collector of the *Mufaḍḍalīyāt*, and died, as stated above, in A. H. 170<sup>29</sup>. The other was Abū Ṭālib al-Mufaḍḍal b. Salama b. 'Āṣim aḍ-Ḍabbī al-Kūfī, who died after 300<sup>30</sup>. It may be worth noticing that he wrote a *Kitāb Jamāhīr al-Qabā'il*. But the two fuller indications in the *Jamhara* are inconsistent with one another, and only the first agrees with the elder al-Mufaḍḍal, while the question still remains, how we are to explain the indication on p. 10, and especially the strange *nisba*, al-Muḥabbārī. On the margin of p. 3 there is given as the reading of one copy, al-Mufaḍḍal b. 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. al-Muḥabbār b. Abd ar-Raḥmān b. 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb. This agrees with the indication on p. 10, which seems to be the reading of all the manuscripts to which the Cairo editors had access: but does not agree with either of the two historically authenticated al-Mufaḍḍals. Further, there is a serious difficulty in the genealogical chain. Ibn Qutayba<sup>31</sup> tells us that 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb had a son al-Mujabbar (or al-Mujabbir) 'Abd ar-Raḥmān, and he again had a son whose name we learn from an-Nawawī<sup>32</sup> was also al-Mujabbar (or Mujabbir), but Ibn Qutayba adds expressly that there was no issue of this line. Have we an instance here of the genealogical ignorance remarked on in the preface to the *Kitāb*



*al-Ma'ūrif*<sup>23</sup>, through which men traced up their origin to a distinguished name and did not notice *lā 'aqba lahu*, 'he had no issue'? Still, whether some links in the chain are forged or not, I have little doubt that we have here the genealogy as Abū Zayd gave it, and a hitherto unknown al-Mufaḍḍal. The name would easily explain the confusion with one or the other of the great grammarians, and the changing of the genealogy to suit him; but it would be hard to explain the reverse process. Further, from the *Isnāds* it can be decisively proved that we have not here the elder al-Mufaḍḍal. On page 3 the tradition is said to go back to Ibn 'Abbās, but the margin gives the longer form, from his father, from his grandfather, from Abū Zabyan<sup>24</sup>, from Ibn 'Abbās (it will be noticed that the first two links in this chain occur in almost all the *Isnāds*); p. 10, he asked his father; p. 11, from his father, from his grandfather, from Muḥammad b. Ishāq (without doubt the Ṣāhib al-Maghāzī, d. 151), from Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh, from Abū Sa'īd al-Khuzā'i, from Abū-ṭ-Ṭufayl 'Āmir b. Wāthila<sup>25</sup>; p. 17, no *Isnād* in the text but on margin as given on the margins of several copies: from his father, from his grandfather, from Abū 'Ubayda, from 'Attāb b. 'Umayr b. 'Abd al-Malik; p. 20, from his father, from his grandfather, from Ibn Ishāq, from Mujāhid<sup>26</sup>, from Ibn 'Abbās; p. 21, from his father, from his grandfather, from al-'Alā b-Maymūn al-Āmidī, from his father; p. 29, from Alī b. Ṭāhir adh-Dhuhli, from Abū 'Ubayda, from al-Mujālid, from ash-Sha'bī; pp. 16, 34, 25, references, but no *Isnāds*. It will be noticed that twice in the above Abū 'Ubayda occurs, once with two links between himself and al-Mufaḍḍal, and once with one. But as Abū 'Ubayda died in 210 and the elder Mufaḍḍal in 170, we certainly here cannot have to do with the elder Mufaḍḍal. But have we then the younger, who died probably after 300? The names are quite different and offer no support to such an idea. I confess I can throw no light upon this matter, and must content myself with simply stating the difficulty and giving the facts as I have them.

To complete the statement of the *Isnāds* contained in the *Jamhara* I must add the following: p. 15, Ibn Ishāq, from 'Abd Allāh b. aṭ-Ṭufayl, from his father, from his grandfather; p. 16, al-Maḡna', from his father, from al-Aṣma'ī<sup>27</sup>; p. 19, Muṭarrif al-Kinānī, from Ibn Da'b; p. 31, 'Isā b. 'Umar; *ibid.*, Abū 'Amr b. al-'Alā. Hommel cites from the copy that von Kremer had made from a Cairo MS., Sunayd b. Muḥammad al-Azdī, from Ibn al-A'rābi<sup>28</sup>; but this I cannot find in the Būlāq text.

As a further dating-point it may be noticed that in the Commentary on 'Antara's *Qaṣīda* (p. 98) a line is quoted from Abū Tammām, the compiler of the *Hamāsa*, 172 or 188 or 190—228 or 231 or 232.

Taking the evidence that has now been presented, scanty and uncertain as it is. I feel inclined to date the present form of the *Jamhara* in the latter part of the third or the beginning of the fourth centuries of the Flight; if anything, later rather than earlier.

From much of the above it will have become evident that the text of this edition varies markedly from those which Nöldeke, Ahlwardt

and Hommel had before them. This is especially the case in the section describing the classes (*ṭabaqāt*) of the poets. There the text is quite different from the fragment quoted by Nöldeke from the Berlin manuscript, and since the passage is very important as throwing light, not only on the history of the *Jamhara*, but also on that of the collecting of Arabic poems generally, I shall translate the whole of it.

It begins on p. 34; "The section making mention of the classes of those of whom we have named some. Abū 'Ubayda said: The greatest poets are the people of the tents especially<sup>39</sup>. They are Imr al-Qays, and Zuhayr, and an-Nābigha. But if any one say that Imr al-Qays is not of the people of Najd, then, verily, these abodes of which he has made mention in his poetry are the abodes of the Banū Asad b. Khuzayma. And in the second class are al-A'shā, and Labīd, and Ṭarafa. And it is said that al-Farazdaq said, Imr al-Qays is the greatest poet; and Jarīr said, an-Nābigha; and al-Akhṭal said, al-A'shā; and Ibn Aḥmar said Zuhayr; and Dhū-r-Rumma said, Labīd; and Ibn Muqbil said, Ṭarafa, and al-Kumayt said, 'Amr. b. Kulthūm; but our opinion [apparently Abū Zayd's] is that of Abū 'Ubayda; that is, Imr al-Qays, then Zuhayr, and an-Nābigha, and al-A'shā, and Labīd, and 'Amr [Abū 'Ubayda does not mention 'Amr above], and Ṭarafa. Al-Mufaḍḍal said: These are the authors of the seven long poems which the Arabs call *as-Sumūt* [the strings of beads or pearls], and whoever says that a place in the seven belongs to other than them has contradicted that in which the people of science and knowledge have united. And we have perceived the most of the people of science saying that after these came seven not inferior to them; and in truth their authors have followed the authors of the first, but have not fallen short of them<sup>40</sup>. And these are the *Muḡamharāt* [collected<sup>41</sup>] by 'Abid b. al-Abras, and 'Antara b. 'Amr, and 'Adī b. Zayd, and Bishr b. Abī Khāzim, and Umayya b. Abī-ṣ-Ṣalt, and Khadāsh b. Zuhayr, and an-Namr b. Tawlab. And as for the *Muntaqayāt* [chosen] of the Arabs, they are by Musayyab b. 'Alas, and al-Muraqqish, and al-Mutalammis, and 'Urwa b. al-Ward, and Muhalhil b. Rabī'a, and Durayd b. aṣ-Ṣimma, and al-Mutan-akhhil b. 'Uwaymir. And as for the *Mudhahhabāt* [gilded], they belong to [the tribes of] al-Aws and al-Khazraj specially, and are by Ḥassān b. Thābit, and 'Abd Allāh b. Rawāḥa, and Mālik b. al-'Ajlān, and Qays b. al-Khaṭīm, and Uḡayḥa b. al-Julāh, and Abū Qays b. al-Aslat, and 'Amr b. Imr al-Qays. And the most highly prized *Marāthī* [laments] are seven, by Abū Dhu'ayb al-Hudhalī, and 'Alqama b. Dhī Jadān al-Himyārī, and Muḥammad b. Ka'b al-Ghanawī, and al-A'shā al-Bāhili, and Abū Zayd aṭ-Ṭā'i, and Mālik b. ar-Rayb an-Nahshalī, and Mutammim b. Nuwayra al-Yarbū'i. And as for the *Mashūtāt* [mixed] of the Arabs, they are those with which unbelief and al-Islām mixed, and they are by Nābigha banī Ja'da, and Ka'b b. Zuhayr, and al-Quṭāmī, and al-Khuṭay'a, and ash-Shammākh, and 'Amr b. Aḥmar, and Ibn Muqbil. And as for the seven *Muḡamāt* [well-joined], they are by al-Farazdaq, and Jarīr, and al-Akhṭal, and 'Ubayd ar-Rā'i, and Dhū-r-Rumma, and al-Kumayt b. Zayd, and aṭ-Ṭirimmāh b. Ḥakīm. Al-

Mufaḍḍal said: These nine and forty *Qaṣidas* are the most highly prized of the poems of the Arabs in the period of the Ignorance and of al-Islām, and the soul of the poetry of each man of them<sup>42</sup>. And Abū 'Ubayda mentioned in the third class of poets, al-Muraqqish and Ka'b b. Zuhayr, and al-Khuṭay'a and Khadāsh b. Zuhayr, and Durayd b. aṣ-Ṣimma, and 'Antara, and 'Urwa b. al-Ward, and an-Namr b. Tawlab, and ash-Shammākh b. Ḍirār, and 'Amr b. Aḥmar. Al-Mufaḍḍal said: These are the mighty ones of the poets of the people of Najd, who blamed and praised, and pursued every kind of poetry. And as for the people of al-Hijāz, they were best in love poetry. And Abū 'Ubayda mentioned that men agreed that the greatest poets of the people of al-Islām were al-Farazdaq, and Jarīr, and al-Akḥṭal."

The relative merits of the three last-named poets are then discussed for about three pages. Then, from the middle of p. 38, various stories about Imr al-Qays are given from Ibn Da'b, derived from al-Farazdaq. The Mu'allāqa of Imr al-Qays begins at the foot of p. 39.

Before going on to examine this passage it may be well to state shortly the views expressed by Nöldeke and Hommel, based upon the Berlin manuscript already referred to. Nöldeke notices first that according to Ibn an-Nahḥās<sup>43</sup> (d. 338), the seven *Mu'allaqāt* were selected by Ḥammād ar-Rāwiyā (d. 167). His view then is that Abū 'Ubayda and al-Mufaḍḍal, whom he takes to be the elder, the collector of the *Mufaḍḍalīyāt*, are represented as agreeing in this choice of Ḥammād's, and that to this first class of seven Abū Zayd selected and added the other six classes. Without doubt this is the right interpretation of the passage as it stands in the Berlin manuscript. Hommel's final view is similar. He thinks that the whole collection had been known to Abū 'Ubayda and al-Mufaḍḍal, and that it was only the present recension, with its commentary and introduction, that was due to Abū Zayd.

But if we are to accept the Būlāq text, those views must be essentially modified. First, as Hommel has already noticed, there is absolutely no mention in the *Jamhara* of Ḥammād ar-Rāwiyā and the part he took in selecting and combining the seven *Mu'allaqāt*, or, as they are called here, *Sumūt*. But I do not feel that we can follow Hommel further and deduce from this that Abū Zayd did not know this tradition, and still less that the tradition is false. There was no necessity for him to mention it at this point, and his whole treatment of the subject shows that he is giving a highly compressed statement. Next, Abū 'Ubayda and al-Mufaḍḍal witness to two quite different things. Abū 'Ubayda has apparently no connection with the *Jamhara* arrangement of seven groups of seven poems each, and knows nothing of it. His arrangement is one into three *Ṭabaqāt*, the first two embracing the seven *Mu'allāqa*-poets, and the third ten other poets. Whether he had yet more classes we are not told; but it is worth noticing that these three classes are limited to poets of Najd. His arrangement is not followed in the *Jamhara*, except in that his first two classes are put into one and made a first class, and that Imr al-Qays is regarded as the greatest poet. Whether he divided into two classes the poems

which Ḥammād had selected and made into one, or Ḥammād combined his two classes must remain unsettled. This would lead us to expect that he had written a book *Ṭabaqāt Shu'arā Najd*, or simply *ash-Shu'arā*, which Abū Zayd is here using; but the nearest I can find is a mention by the *Fihrist* of a book by him *Kitāb ash-Sh'ir wash-Shu'arā*.

But al-Mufaḍḍal, whoever he was, evidently knew the *Jamhara* arrangement of seven groups of seven, whether it was due to him or not. Therefore, leaving the positive question of its authorship open, we may fix one thing, viz., that it is not to be ascribed to Abū Zayd. But is it not possible to push the origin further back, and say of some at least of the classes what we know of the first? Some of them are spoken of as well known as selections and under these names. In none of them is the grouping of the seven poems together said to have been coincident in time with the grouping of the seven classes together. Thus, we have the *Muntaqayāt al-'Arab* and the *Mashūbāt al-'Arab*, just exactly as we have the poems called *as-Sumūt* by the Arabs. So, too, we have the seven *Mulḥamāt*. If we did not know of the *Sumūt*, or *Mu'allaqāt* (a term never used by Abū Zayd), separately, we could not draw any distinction between them and the others. Because the other six classes have not survived as separate entities, have we any right to say that they never were separate? After Ḥammād ar-Rāwīya or Abū 'Ubayda, as the case may be, had made his selection of seven, is it not probable that others would also form selections of seven in imitation? As the first selection was called the *Sumūt* or *Mu'allaqāt*, so the others might be called the *Mujamharāt*<sup>44</sup> or the *Mashūbāt*. We know of many that were formed but have now vanished—melted into the greater—as these into the *Jamhara*. The *Fihrist* tells us that Abū Tammām made different selections beside the Ḥamāsa. He had a *Kitāb al-Ikhtiyār min Ash'ār al-Qabā'il*, and we may notice that one of our seven classes is devoted to poets of the two tribes of al-Madīna, al-Aws and al-Khazraj. So, too, he had a *Kitāb al-Fuḥūl*. Further, the fact that the names of the selectors of the seven poems in each of the last six classes are not mentioned, agrees with the non-mention of Ḥammād, or Abū 'Ubayda, as the selector of the first class. All seven are, in this matter, on exactly the same footing.

If we are, then, to regard this as a compilation from previously separate groups, can we ascribe the choice of the name *Jamhara* to the title of the second group, *al-Mujamharāt*? Could a name not be derived from that of the first group, the *Sumūt*, because that was the oldest and best known, and confusion might arise? But the point is of no importance, and I may repeat again that we may regard it as certain that Abū Zayd was only the editor of this recension of the collection of seven groups of seven poems, and not its originator. To him we probably owe the introduction and the commentary, and it may be possible to draw from them some ideas of his character. I can only touch here upon one or two points, as a detailed statement would involve a more careful study of the book than my time has allowed.

He appears to have been a Muslim of pious tendencies and no special critical acumen. In his preface he tells us that the early poets are chiefly valuable because they assist us to understand the Qur'ān. So any scholar of his day would have said; but he takes it somewhat in earnest, and gives us seven pages of illustrations<sup>45</sup>. The very first of these, a beautiful verse of Imr al-Qays only preserved here, will give an idea of his feeling for poetry. It runs :

تَفَا فَاسْأَلَا الْأَطْلَالَ عَنْ أُمِّ مَالِكٍ \* وَهَلْ تُخْبِرُ الْأَطْلَالَ غَيْرَ التَّهَائِكِ

'Stand and ask the ruins concerning Umm Mālik ! But will ruins give any tidings save of falling to ruin<sup>46</sup> ?

On which Abū Zayd remarks : He certainly knew that the ruins would not reply, and only meant, Ask the people of the ruins. Further, on p. 35 he has added to an opinion from Abū 'Ubayda that al-Farazdaq, Jarīr and al-Akhṭal are the greatest poets of the time of al-Islām, a remark that that is always excepting Ḥassān b. Thābit, for no one can be compared with the poet of the Prophet of God. Again, on the vexed question of the presence of foreign words in the Qur'ān, he takes up the stiffest and most orthodox position. The Qur'ān has been definitely said to be in perspicuous Arabic, and so Arabic only it can be. If we find words in it that are like Persian or Greek or Syriac words, what of it? Cannot the two languages have the same word for the same thing without there being a connection? So he and one school of Muslim Theologians cleared the difficulty.<sup>47</sup>

From this will be evident what we are to expect of Abū Zayd acting independently ; but there can be no question of the importance of the collection that has come down to us under his name. If some of the poems have been published elsewhere since Hommel drew up his list and noted that 1400 lines were new, yet he did not reckon with that number the poems which occur also in the *Mufaḍḍaliyāt* which Thorbecke was then editing. But Thorbecke's edition remains a fragment, and these poems are still unedited. On my part there has been no attempt to trace what is published and what not. That would be a work of much time, and I have only been able to gather up the more salient points throwing light on the date and origin of the book. Names which I have given up as hopeless will be traced by others, and my trust is that the complete collection of *Isnāds* may be of assistance in this. Those who have had anything to do with Arab biography know how perplexing and unsatisfying is the search through a jungle of *Laqabs*, *Kunyas*, *Nisbas* and *Isms* for some name that, in the end, we do not find. Such will be charitable towards the smallness of my results, and seeking that charity, I would close with the old jingle that has done duty so often :

ان تجد عيبا فسدّ الحلالا جلد من لا عيب فيه وعلا

NOTES.

<sup>1</sup> *Actes du sixième Congrès international des Orientalistes*, Deuxième partie, sect. i. pp. 387-408.

<sup>2</sup> *Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Poesie der alten Araber*, pp. xx, xxi.

<sup>3</sup> Pp. xix, xx, xxvii, and 193.

<sup>4</sup> *British Museum Catalogue of Arabic MSS.*, ii. pp. 481ff, 747ff; *Bodleian Cat. of Arabic MSS.*, i. 268: No. 174 Coll. Pococke; Wüstenfeld, *Yāqūt*, v. 48; Ahlwardt, *Verz. der arab. Handschr. (poetischen Inhalts) in der könig. Bibl. zu Berlin*, S. 179, No. 1000; Von Kremer, *Cat. of his MSS. in Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie*, 1885 (cix), p. 216; Landberg, *Cat. of Arab. MSS. in the possession of Brill of Leyden*, the collection of Emin el-Madani (Leiden, 1883) pp. 92f. and 94f., Nos. 310 and 311.

<sup>5</sup> The poem of 'Antara which stands second in the second class in Hommel's list, stands first in the Būlāq text. Further, the Būlāq text is richer, in all, by about 67 lines.

<sup>6</sup> See the review of this work by Prym and Socin, *Z.D.M.G.* xxxi, 667 ff.

<sup>7</sup> ومما ذكر في هذا الكتاب المعلقات التسع والأربعون  
مقسمة إلى سبعة أقسام كل قسم سبع قصائد ملقبات بلقب  
مخصوص بها \* نسخة في مجلدين بقلم عادى \*

<sup>8</sup> I have had to read here *فحول الشعر* instead of *فحول الشعراء*. This seems necessary in order to get a noun to which the suffix in *بحر* may refer but perhaps it may be possible to supply that from *الشعراء*. The text-reading is, of course, the common phrase.

<sup>9</sup> Ahlwardt has on p. xix. of the "Six Divans," *'alī elkhathāb* as the reading of the Berlin MS.; but on p. 193 (the Arabic preface to the *أبن ابى الخطاب*, (تعليقة).

<sup>10</sup> Būlāq edition, x. 160.

<sup>11</sup> Part ii., p. 481, note. I quote through Hommel, as this catalogue is inaccessible to me. It refers also to the *Muzhir* of as-Suyūṭī. 'Abd al-Qādir al-Baghdādī, in his list of books used in writing the *Khizāna al-Adab*, includes the *Jamhara*, but does not mention Abū Zayd.

<sup>12</sup> Wüstenfeld, *Grammatische Schulen*, p. 68 ff.; *Fihrist*, p. 53 f.

<sup>13</sup> Ibn Qutayba, *Kitāb al-Ma'ārif*, p. 229.

<sup>14</sup> *Fihrist*, p. 111.

<sup>15</sup> Ibn Qut., p. 169; an-Nawawī, s. v.

<sup>16</sup> Ibn Qut., p. 268.

<sup>17</sup> P. 229, and references in note.

<sup>18</sup> De Slane, *Ibn Khallikān*, iv. 253, note.

<sup>19</sup> Ibn Qut., p. 267.

<sup>20</sup> Wüstenfeld, *Ibn Khallikān*, No. 732.

<sup>21</sup> Ibn Qut., p. 267.

<sup>22</sup> Wüstenfeld, *Ibn Khall.*, No. 261.

<sup>23</sup> Ibn Qut., p. 247; Wüstenfeld, *Ibn Khall.*, No. 623.

<sup>24</sup> De Slane, *Ibn Khall.*, iv. 225.

<sup>25</sup> To these may be added a Muḥammad b. Ḥasan al-Warrāq, who died في حدود الثلاثين ومائتين, and who wrote mostly religious and gnomic poetry (*Fawāt al-Wafayāt*, ii. 356); and an Abū-l-'Abbās Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Kātib, who wrote a كتاب الخراج, and died 270 (Hājī Khalifa, v. 80).

<sup>26</sup> *Fihrist*, pp. 79; 157, l. 18; and 158, l. 21. In the last passage simply under his *Kunya*. Hājī Khalifa, iii. 150. Wüstenfeld, *Gramm. Schulen*, p. 196 f.

<sup>27</sup> ثم كبر سنى وضعت ولزمت زود. For Zarūd see *Marāṣid*, s. v., and *Bibl. Geogr. Arab.*, vii., ١٧٩ and ٣١١.

<sup>28</sup> Was confusion produced by the Abū-l-'Abbās al-Marwazī who died in 274 (*Fihrist*, p. 150)?

<sup>29</sup> Wüstenfeld, *Gramm. Schulen*, p. 142 ff.

<sup>30</sup> Wüstenfeld, *Gramm. Schulen*, p. 162 ff.

<sup>31</sup> P. 92, 94.

<sup>32</sup> Wüstenfeld, *An-Nawawī*, p. 385. The form of the name given in Ibn Qut. seems to be right, though it is left in doubt whether we have the form of the active or of the passive participle. On the other hand the المكبر of the *Jamhara* appears to be quite false. In the Cairo reprint of Ibn Qutayba it has become المكبر. An-Nawawī tells how

قال ابن عبد البر وإنما قيل له المكبر لأنه وقع وهو غلام فتكسر فحمل إلى عمته حفصة أم المؤمنين فقيل انظري إلى ابن أخيك المكسر فقالت ليس بالمكسر ولكنه المكبر

<sup>33</sup> Ibn Qut., p. 1 and 2.

<sup>34</sup> Ibn Durayd, *Kitāb al-Ishtiqāq*, p. 289.

<sup>35</sup> Ibn Qut., p. 173.

<sup>36</sup> An-Nawawī, p. 540.

<sup>37</sup> Ibn Qut., p. 270.

<sup>38</sup> Ibn Qut., p. 271. Wüstenfeld, *Gramm. Schulen*, p. 145 ff.

<sup>39</sup> باب ذكر طبقات من سينا منهم \* قال ابو عبيدة أشعر الناس أهل الوجي خاصة . . . .

<sup>40</sup> قال المفضل هؤلاء أصحاب السبع الطوال التي تسميها العرب السموط فمن قال أن السبع لغيرهم فقد خالف ما أجمع عليه

أهل العلم والمعرفة وقد أدركنا أكثر أهل العلم يقولون أن  
بعدهن سبعا ما هن بدونهن ولقد تلا أحمابهن أحماب  
الأوائل فما قصروا وهن المجبهرات

It may be of use, perhaps, to reprint here the fragment from the Berlin MS. given by Nöldeke in the *Beiträge* (p. xx.): وقال المفضل القول عندنا ما قاله ابو عبيدة في ترتيب طبقاتهم وهو أن أول طبقاتهم أحماب السبع معلقات وهم امرؤ القيس وزهير والنابعة والأعشى وليبد وعمرو بن كلثوم وطرفة بن العبد قال المفضل هاؤلاء أحماب السبع الطوال التي تسميها العرب بالسوط ومن زعم غير ذلك فقد خالف جمهور العلماء

The repetition of the قال المفضل shows that something is wrong with the text, and comparison with the Būlāq edition shows what it is. Notice, too, the occurrence of the term المعلقات, which never appears in the Būlāq edition. The later form of tradition will be found in as-Suyūṭī's *Muzhir*, Naw' 49; ed. Cairo 1282, iii. 234.

<sup>41</sup> Nöldeke translates *die Berühmten*. I have followed Lane.

<sup>42</sup> قال المفضل فهذه التسعة الاربعون قصيدة عيون اشعار العرب في الجاهلية والاسلام ونفس شعر كل رجل منهم

I am not certain that I have caught the exact meaning of the last phrase.

<sup>43</sup> This tradition was only known to Nöldeke through a note by al-Khafāji on the *Durra al-Ghawwāṣ* of al-Ḥarīrī, but see Appendix.

<sup>44</sup> Father Lewis Cheikho, in *Les poètes arabes chrétiens*, p. 233, 234, gives the *Jamhara* poem of Umayya b. Abī-ṣ-Ṣalt, and remarks:

وهي قصيدة تعد من مجبهرات العرب. This may mean nothing; but it may also mean that there is a separate MS. of the *Mujamharāt al-'Arab* in the Jesuit Library at Bayrūt. There are evidently some MSS. there of high value, and a catalogue of the collection would be of the greatest interest.

<sup>45</sup> Compare with this as-Suyūṭī's *Itqān*. On p. 125 ff. ('*Uthmāniya* ed., Cairo 1306) there is a long section on the subject, in which Ibn 'Abbās is represented as saying: Poetry is the Record (*Dīwān*) of the Arabs.



Then, whenever anything in the Qur'ān which God has revealed in the tongue of the Arabs is obscure, we turn to their Record.

<sup>46</sup> In Ahlwardt's *Six Divans*, p. 199, this line is quoted from the Berlin MS., but the second *Miṣrā'* is different :

وَهَلْ غَيَّرَ الْأَطْلَالُ غَيْرَ التَّهَالِكِ , 'And has aught changed the ruins  
save falling to ruin ?'

<sup>47</sup> Compare al-Jawālīqī's *Kitāb al-Mu'arrab*, p. 3-5 of Sachau's edition; and as-Suyūṭī's *Iṭqān*, p. 142 ff. Perhaps this is not so much a case of orthodoxy as of Arab *versus* 'Ajamī. Abū Zayd will not admit foreign words to be in the Qur'ān ; it is pure Arabic. So, too, we are to interpret it according to the Arab poets, not the theological ideas of non-Arabs. This position would be highly intelligible in one of the tribe of Quraysh.

#### APPENDIX.

In his *Beiträge*, p. xix, xx,\* Nöldeke speaks as though an-Naḥḥās knew not only the story of the hanging on the Ka'ba, but also the name *al-Mu'allagāt* as applied to the seven poems. That is certainly the impression that al-Khafājī gives, but it appears to be incorrect. Nöldeke cited the passage from a manuscript, but it has since been published twice ; once by Thorbecke in his edition of Ḥarīrī's *Durra al-Ghawwās* (p. 47), and in the Constantinople edition (Press of *Jawā'ib*, A. H. 1299) of the *Durra*, with al-Khafājī's *sharḥ* (p. 229). Compare too, Wüstenfeld, *Ibn Khallikān*, No. 204, and Kosegarten, *Mu'allaga of 'Amr*, p. 66—the last is an anonymous scholiast. Al-Khafājī, *à propos* of a mention of Ḥammād in the *Durra*, says : وهو الذي جمع

السبع المعلقة وسَمَّيت معلقات لأنهم كانوا إذا أنشدوا شعرا  
في مجامعهم يقول كبارهم علقوها إشارة إلى أنه مما ينبغي أن  
يحفظ وما قيل من أنها عُلقت في الكعبة لا أصل له كما قال  
[Constan. edit. قاله] ابن التماس

But Frenkel in his edition of the *Mu'allaga* of Imr al-Qays with the commentary of an-Naḥḥās (Halle a/S, 1876), has given from the Berlin MS. (Wetzstein i. 56) an-Naḥḥās's own words. The passage is worth quoting at length ; for it has several points of contact with the *Jamhara*, and throws light upon the history of the term *Mu'allaga*. It comes at the end of the commentary on 'Amr b. Kulthūm, whose *Qaṣida* stands

\* Compare his article, 'Mo'allakāt,' *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 9th ed., xvi. 536 ff.  
—Ed.

قال ابو جعفر فهذا اخر السبع المشهورات seventh with him. على ما رأيت أهل اللغة يذهبون إليه منهم ابو الحسن بن كيسان وليس لنا ان نعترض في هذا فنقول من الشعر ما هو أجود من هذه كما أنه ليس لنا أن نعترض في الالقاب وإنما نوذّيها على ما نُقلت إلينا نكو المصدر والحال والتبيين وقد رأيت من يذهب إلى أن قصيدة الأعشى ودّع هُرَيْرَةَ وقصيدة النابغة وهي يا دار مَيَّة من هذه القصائد وقد بيّنا أن هذا لا يؤخذ بقياس غير أننا أكثر أهل اللغة يذهب إلى أن أشعر الجاهلية امرؤ القيس وزهير بن أبي سلمى والنابغة والأعشى إلا أبا عبيدة فإنه قال أشعر الجاهلية ثلاثة امرؤ القيس وزهير والنابغة فحدانا قول أكثر أهل اللغة على إملاء قصيدة الأعشى وقصيدة النابغة لتقديبهم إياهما وإن كانتا ليستا من القصائد السبع عند أكثرهم واختلفوا في جمع هذه القصائد السبع وقيل أن العرب كان أكثرهم يجتمع بعكاظ ويتناشدون الشعر فإذا استحسن الملك قصيدة قال علّقوها وأثبتوها في خزائني فأما قول من قال أنها علّقت في الكعبة فلا يعرفه أحد من الرواة وأصح ما قيل في هذا أن حمّاداً الراوية لما رأى زُهدَ الناس في الشعر جمع هذه السبع وحضهم عليها وقال لهم هذا هي المشهورات فسمّيت القصائد المشهورة لهذا ونَبْدأ بقصيدة الأعشى لأن أبا عبيدة قال لم يُقَلْ في الجاهلية على رويها مثلها

Apparently Hommel, who wrote in 1884, did not know that this passage had been printed, for he only refers to Ahlwardt's *Bemerkung*, p. 13, who, in turn, makes only a reference to the Berlin MS. Nor does Frenkel appear to have recognized the importance of the passage which he gives. One point that is clear from it is that an-Naḥḥās does not state as so definite a fact of knowledge as al-Khafājī gives us to understand, that Ḥammād collected the seven poems. He simply gives it as the sounder opinion: *aṣaḥḥu mā qīla fī ḥādhā*. Apparently, in his time (he died 338), there were many different reports, and he regarded this as the most trustworthy. Then, as to the plan on which his own collection was based, an-Naḥḥās tells us that he wished to give the seven poems that were called *al-Mashhūrāt*, the collecting of which he assigns to Ḥammād. As to which poems were included in this collection, he follows Abū-l-Ḥasan b. Kaysān without considering himself whether some other poems might not be better than these. This suggests that some in his time did consider that question, and therefore, the seven may have become confused. Further, his mention of Ibn Kaysān suggests that there were other traditions as to what poems belonged to the *Mashhūrāt*.

Further, some inserted among the seven the *Qaṣīda* of al-A'shā beginning, *وَدَّعْ هُرَيْرَةَ*, and that of an-Nābigha beginning, *يَا دَارَ مَيَّةَ*

[both in the *Jamhara* seven, but not with these poems]; but this was not based on a regular tradition, but simply because these two poets were reckoned among the four best poets of the time of Ignorance. Yet Abū 'Ubayda only reckoned three to the first class, omitting from it al-A'shā (see the *Jamhara*). An-Naḥḥās, therefore, determined to add these two poems, making up the number to nine. He then explains what difference of opinion there was as to how these seven came to be collected. Some held by the story of the fair of 'Ukāz, and that the best poems were selected and preserved there. Others affirmed that they were hung in the Ka'ba; but an-Naḥḥās rejects this utterly,—"not one of the Rāwīs knows anything of it." He then gives his adherence to the story about Ḥammād, that having noticed the indifference of the people to poetry, he collected these seven and brought them to their notice, and told them that they were the most celebrated. Thence they had their name, *al-Mashhūrāt*, by which an-Naḥḥās apparently knew them. Then he remarks that of the two additional *Qaṣīdas* he puts that of al-A'shā first, because Abū 'Ubayda had said that there was no other poem of the Ignorance in the same rhyme-letter equal to it.

In all this the most striking point is that he does not seem to have known the seven under the name of the *Mu'allaqāt*. For him they were the *Mashhūrāt*. That is the name which he gives and explains here, as well as at the beginning of his commentary. So, too, at-Tibrīzī (d. 420), in his commentary on ten poems (the nine of an-Naḥḥās with the addition of the *Bā Qaṣīda* of 'Abīd b. al-Abras edit., Lyall), who follows an-Naḥḥās closely, speaks only of 'the seven *Qaṣīdas*.'

Similarly, az-Zawzanī (d. 486), so far as I can trace him, speaks only of 'the seven *Qaṣīdas*,' and never uses the term *Mu'allagāt*. Ibn Khallikān (d. 681) is the first whom I find using that term, and he speaks of 'the nine *Mu'allagāt*.' In Wüstenfeld's text there stands السبع, but the reading in Ibn Khallikān's autograph MS. in the British Museum is التسع. [It may be worth mentioning that August Müller carefully collated this MS. (Add. 25,735), covering three-quarters of the book, with his copy of Wüstenfeld's edition, which is now in the Hartford Seminary Library.] With as-Suyūṭī (d. 911) in the *Muzhir*, and al-Khafāji (d. 1069) we find the term in its modern use. Further, none of the Lexicons explains the term in this sense, not even the *Qāmūs*, in spite of Freytag's *Kam*.

But though an-Naḥḥās does not use the term *Mu'allagāt*, yet he uses the verb علق, apparently in the sense 'to select and preserve a poem.' Does this mean that *Mu'allaga* may be said of any poem that is selected from others and preserved carefully, distinguished in any way? Was that its first usage, and was it not till later, much later, that it came to be applied to the seven which Ḥammād had picked out and called *al-Mashhūrāt*? Apparently it was still in the stage of being applicable to any selected poem when Ibn Khallikān wrote, as he speaks of the nine *Mu'allagāt* of an-Naḥḥās. This would indicate that the story about the Ka'ba was not invented to explain the name; for the story existed long before the common noun had become a name. Another question that rises is this. Is there any connection, after all, between the first class of the *Jamhara*, i. e., the *Sumūt*, and Ḥammād's seven? Are they not, perhaps, quite distinct sevens? It is true that five names occur in both: Imr al-Qays, Zuhayr, Labīd, 'Amr and Ṭarafa. But neither 'Antara nor al-Ḥārith are in the *Jamhara*, nor are an-Nābigha or al-A'shā in Ḥammād's seven. The names are different: Ḥammād's are called *al-Mashhūrāt*; the *Jamhara*'s, *as-Sumūt*. The story of their origin and originator is different. The *Jamhara* seven, if connected with any one as originator, is connected with Abū 'Ubayda. I have already suggested that probably there were many more collections of seven than we have hitherto supposed or identified. At a later stage, they would become confused with one another or be swallowed up in the greater collections. Thus the name *as-Sumūt* might come in time to be applied to Ḥammād's seven as on the title page of Arnold's edition.

Finally, I would notice that in both the *Ṣaḥāḥ* and the *Lisān*, سَبَط and سَبْط are explained by علق; and we have in the *Lisān*

وَالسَّبْطُ خَيْطُ النَّظْمِ لِأَنَّهُ يُعَلَّقُ

8. A New Fragment of the Babylonian "Etana"-legend; by Professor Morris Jastrow, Jr., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Penn.

This paper will be published in full in the forthcoming number of Haupt and Delitzsch's *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, Vol. III., Part 2. The fragment in question was obtained at Kouyunjik by the late Rev. W. F. Williams, at the time when Sir A. H. Layard was conducting his excavations at that place. Through the kindness of Mr. Talcott Williams, of Philadelphia, it was placed at the disposal of the writer. The fragment reveals the close of an episode in the "Etana"-legend. The eagle who has destroyed the serpent's nest dies a disgraceful death. The serpent is avenged, aided by Šamaš—the sun-god—who indicates the manner in which the death of the eagle can be brought about. In connection with the fragment, some general questions affecting the order of the episodes composing the "Etana"-legend were discussed; and the suggestion was also ventured that the mysterious *Ethan* (or *Etan*) mentioned in I Kgs. v, ii among the "wise" men of old may be a dimmed tradition of the Babylonian Etana. At all events, the names are identical. Ethan and Etana signify "the strong one," which was a favorite epithet of the Semitic gods and heroes.

9. Note on the Term Mušannītum; by Professor Morris Jastrow, Jr., of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Penn.

The full text of this paper will be found in *Hebraica*, Vol. X., pp. 193-5. It offers an explanation for a word of frequent occurrence in the legal literature of the Babylonians. With the help of a comparison with a Talmudic term מִשְׁנִיתָא, the conclusion was reached that the Babylonian word was used to designate the "embankment" that the climatic conditions of the Euphrates valley rendered necessary as a protection to fields during the rainy season. The word is derived from a stem שָׁנַן, meaning to be "pointed," and the form is contracted from *mušannintum* = *mušanittum* = *mušanitum*. In the technical sense of "embankment," the Talmudic term was shown to be a loan-word from the Babylonian, the writing מִשְׁנִיתָא instead of מוֹשְׁנִיתָא being due to an adaptation of the borrowed word to one already existing in Aramaic, and used in a manner that favored a supposed connection with the foreign word. The term also occurs as a loan-word in Arabic, *musannāt*. There appears also the form שְׁנִיתָא, without the מ.

10. On the Language of the Sinjirli Inscriptions; by Professor R. J. H. Gottheil, of Columbia College, New York, N. Y.

In connection with the Sinjirli inscriptions, Professor Gottheil pointed out the close connection which existed between the older Aramaic (in the inscriptions and in the Bible) and the Hebrew. Many peculiarities common to both these dialects are found again in the Assyrian. It is

only in its later development that the Aramaic branched off so perceptibly from the Hebrew. This will also serve to explain how the Assyrian shows peculiarities in lexicon and grammatical structure which at times agree with the Hebrew, at times with the Aramaic dialects.

11. Notes ; by Professor George A. Barton, of Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Penn.\*

1. *On the Semitic Ishtar Cult.*

Professor D. H. Müller's *Epigraphische Denkmäler aus Abessinien* contains an inscription which gives evidence of the existence of the Ishtar Cult in Abyssinia. The writer had previously found traces of it in all the other countries of the Semitic area.

An inscription published by Derenbourg in the *Journal Asiatique* proves the theory of the late Professor W. R. Smith that Athtar was originally a mother goddess in Arabia, and then developed into a masculine diety, as it shows clearly the transition from the one to the other.

2. *On the God Mut.*

The writer had shown in a paper published elsewhere that there was a god Maut or Mut among the Hebrews. The discovery of traces of the worship of the Egyptian god Mut near Gaza in Palestine in the time of the El Amarna tablets suggests the possibility that the Hebrew god may have been borrowed from the Egyptians.

3. *Was Ilu ever a Distinct Deity in Babylonia?*

The object of this paper was to suggest the possibility of a different explanation of *Ilu*, as an element of proper names, from that followed by recent scholars. The analogy of other proper names and of the history of Ishtar suggest, though they do not clearly prove, that *Ilu* was once a distinct deity.

12. The XXIII. Psalm ; an Essay on Hebrew Verse ; by Rev. F. P. Ramsay, Augusta, Ky.

Hebrew poetry is not musical, but pictorial. It is not metrical in form. It has what may be called verses or lines, but the line has not a given number of accents, nor are the accents arranged in a given order. Each line presents a single complete picture. This picture is itself the blending together usually of two simpler pictures, each presented in a distinct phrase. The image or conception in a phrase is a unity of two elements, as, say, a subject and its action ; but the phrase may have less or more than two words. Generally each line is one of a couplet, giving companion pictures.

---

\* These papers have appeared in full in *Hebraica*, Vol. X, p. 202 ff.

The Psalm may be thus arranged, to illustrate the theory :

יהוה רעי	לא אחר
בנאות דשא	רבי'צני
על מי מנחות ינהלני	נפשי ישוב
ינחני במעגלי צדק	למען שמו
גם כי אלך בגיא צלמות	לא אירא רע
כי אתה עמדי	שבטך ומשענתך המה ינחמני
תעריך לפני שלחן	נגד צרי
דשנת בשמן ראשי	כוס ריה
אך טוב וחסד ירדפוני	כל ימי חי
ושבתי בבית יהוה	לארך ימים

Other communications were presented as follows :

13. On some Hebrew MSS. from Egypt ; by Dr. Cyrus Adler, of the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.

14. On the origin of games and divination in Eastern Asia ; by Mr. Stewart Culin, of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Penn.

15. On the Bharats and the Bharatas : by Professor E. W. Hopkins, of Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Penn.

16. On a complete verbal index to the Fiqh-al-Luqha of Ath-tha 'Alibi ; by Professor D. B. Macdonald, of Hartford, Conn.

17. On the Agnihotra-section of the Jāiminiya-brāhmaṇa ; by Dr. Hanns Oertel, of Yale University, New Haven, Conn. To be published in the Journal.

18. An emendation of Sāyaṇa on S. B. i. 3. 2 ; by Dr. Oertel.

19. On some unpublished Arabic inscriptions in Morocco and elsewhere ; by Mr. Talcott Williams, of Philadelphia, Penn.

20. Report of excavations at Jerusalem through the Palestine Exploration Fund ; by Rev. T. F. Wright, D.D., Cambridge, Mass.

21. Note on the Julian inscription described by Dr. I. H. Hall at the meeting of March, 1894 ; by Dr. Wright. Published in the Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund, April, 1895.

Papers by Professor M. Bloomfield, of the Johns Hopkins University, and Professor A. V. Williams Jackson, of Columbia College, were read at the Second Joint Session, Friday, December 28th.

JOINT MEETING  
OF THE  
AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY  
AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION  
SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS  
MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA  
AMERICAN DIALECT SOCIETY  
SPELLING REFORM ASSOCIATION  
AND THE  
ARCHÆOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OF AMERICA

AT  
THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA

DECEMBER 27-29, 1894.

---

JOINT SESSIONS.

OPENING SESSION.

Thursday, December 27, at 12 M.

Address by Mr. C. C. Harrison, Acting Provost of the University of Pennsylvania, introducing the Presiding Officer of the Meeting, Professor A. Marshall Elliott, of the Johns Hopkins University, President of the Modern Language Association of America.

Address of Welcome by Dr. Horace Howard Furness, Philadelphia.



SECOND JOINT SESSION.

Friday, December 28, at 10 A. M.

Presiding Officer of the Meeting, Prof. John Henry Wright, of Harvard University, President of the American Philological Association.

1. Dr. J. P. Peters, New York, and Prof. H. V. Hilprecht, University of Philadelphia. The last results of the Babylonian expedition of the University of Pennsylvania.
2. Prof. William W. Goodwin, Harvard University. The Athenian *γραφῇ παρανόμων* and the American doctrine of constitutional law.
3. Prof. Minton Warren, Johns Hopkins University. The contribution of the Latin inscriptions to the study of the Latin language and literature.
4. Prof. A. V. Williams Jackson, Columbia College. Cyrus's dream of the winged figure of Darius in Herodotus.
5. Prof. Hermann Collitz, Bryn Mawr College. Some Modern German etymologies.
6. Prof. Maurice Bloomfield, Johns Hopkins University. On Prof. Streitberg's theory as to the origin of certain long Indo-European vowels.
7. Prof. Federico Halbherr, University of Rome. Explorations in Krete for the Archæological Institute (read by Prof. Frothingham).
8. Prof. Edward S. Sheldon, Harvard University. The work of the American Dialect Society, 1889-1894.

---

THIRD JOINT SESSION.

Friday, December 28, at 8 P. M.

MEMORIAL MEETING

IN HONOR OF

WILLIAM DWIGHT WHITNEY.

Presiding Officer of the Meeting, President Daniel Coit Gilman, of Johns Hopkins University, President of the American Oriental Society.

1. Reading of letters from foreign scholars.

2. MEMORIAL ADDRESS by Prof. Charles R. Lanman, Harvard University.
  3. Whitney's influence on the study of modern languages and on lexicography, by Prof. Francis A. March, Lafayette College.
  4. Whitney's influence on students of classical philology, by Prof. Bernadotte Perrin, Yale University.
  5. Address by Prof. J. Irving Manatt, Brown University.
  6. Address by Rev. Dr. William Hayes Ward, New York.
  7. Concluding address by President Daniel Coit Gilman.
- 

## SPECIAL SESSIONS.

### AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

(Organized 1869.)

1. Mortimer Lamson Earle, Ph.D., Barnard College. Sophocles *Trachiniae*, 26-48 : a Study in Interpretation.
2. Prof. Louis Bevier, Jr., Rutgers College. The Delphian Hymns and the Pronunciation of the Greek Vowels.
3. Prof. Alfred Gudeman, University of Pennsylvania. Plutarch as a Philologist.
4. Prof. Edwin W. Fay, of Washington and Lee University. ARYAN  $tr_2^\circ = \text{GRK. } \pi\lambda^\circ = \text{LAT. } cl^\circ$ , ARY.  $dr_2^\circ = \beta\lambda^\circ = \text{LAT. } gl^\circ$ .
5. Prof. C. R. Lanman of Harvard University. Reflected Meanings ; a Point in Semantics.
6. Prof. Karl P. Harrington, of the University of North Carolina. Notes on the Diction of the *Apocolocyntosis Divi Claudii*.
7. Prof. W. A. Lamberton, of the University of Pennsylvania. Notes on Thucydides.
8. Dr. Arthur Fairbanks, of Yale University. Local Cults in Homer.
9. Dr. Mitchell Carroll, of the Johns Hopkins University. Aristotle on the Faults of Poetry ; or Poetics xxv. in the Light of the Homeric Scholia.
10. Dr. Charles Knapp, of Barnard College. Notes on Horace.
11. Prof. M. W. Easton, of the University of Pennsylvania. Remarks upon Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, chiefly with reference to the text.

12. W. C. Lawton, of Philadelphia. A National Form of Verse the Natural Unit for the Thought.
13. Prof. Frank L. Van Cleef, of Cornell University. Confusion of *δέξα* and *τέσραpes* in Thucydides.
14. Dr. B. Newhall, of Brown University. Women's Speech in Classical Literature.
15. Prof. E. G. Sihler, of the University of the City of New York. St. Paul and the *Lex Julia de vi*.
16. Dr. James M. Paton, of Cambridge, Mass. Some Spartan Families under the Empire.
17. Prof. H. W. Magoun of Oberlin College. Pliny's Laurentine Villa.
18. Prof. John Williams White, of Harvard University. The pre-Themistoclean Wall at Athens.
19. Prof. Hermann Collitz, of Bryn Mawr College. The etymology of *ἀρα* and of *μάψ*.
20. Prof. J. Irving Manatt, of Brown University. The Literary Evidence for Dörpfeld's Enneakrounos.
21. Prof. Benjamin Ide Wheeler, of Cornell University. The Greek Duals in -ε.
22. Prof. John Henry Wright, of Harvard University. A note on Alexander Polyhistor (Euseb. *Chron.* I. 15, 16 Schöne).
23. Prof. Herbert Weir Smyth, of Bryn Mawr College. On Greek Tragic Anapaests.
24. Prof. A. V. Williams Jackson, of Columbia College in the City of New York. Two ancient Persian Names in Greek, *Ἀραύκτης* and *Φαυδύμη*.
25. Mortimer Lamson Earle, Ph.D., of Barnard College. Some Remarks on the Moods of Will in Greek.
26. Prof. Edwin W. Fay, of Washington and Lee University. ARYAN *gn*=LATIN *mn*.
27. Prof. Carl Darling Buck, of the University of Chicago. The Passive in Oscan-Umbrian.
28. Prof. W. J. Battle, of the University of Texas (read by title). Magical Curses written on Lead Tablets.
29. Dr. Charles Knapp, of Barnard College (read by title). Lexicographical Notes.
30. Prof. W. G. Hale, of the University of Chicago. On the Latin Subjunctive and the Greek Optative in Indirect Discourse.

31. Prof. M. Bloomfield, of the Johns Hopkins University. On the Etymology of ἀεῖδω.

Papers by Prof. W. W. Goodwin, of Harvard University, and Prof. Minton Warren, of the Johns Hopkins University, were read at the Second Joint Session, Friday, December 28th.

---

SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS.

(Organized 1880.)

1. Prof. George A. Barton, Bryn Mawr College. On the interpretation of שֶׁבֶט סֵפֶר, Judges v. 14.
2. Dr. Isaac H. Hall, Metropolitan Museum, New York. On the new Syriac Gospels.
3. Prof. Lewis B. Paton, Hartford Theological Seminary. Did Amos approve the calf-worship at Bethel?
4. Dr. T. F. Wright, New Church School, Cambridge, Mass. The Songs of Degrees.
5. Prof. J. Henry Thayer, Harvard University. σὺ εἶπας, σὺ λέγεις, Mat. xxvi. 64, John xviii. 37, etc.
6. Rev. Benjamin W. Bacon, Oswego, N. Y. The displacement of John xiv.
7. Prof. Morris Jastrow, Jr., University of Pennsylvania. Hebrew proper names compounded with יְהוֹ and יְהוִי.
8. Prof. Paul Haupt, Johns Hopkins University. On 2 Samuel i. 23.
9. Rev. William H. Cobb, Boston. Julius Ley on Isaiah xl.-lxvi.
10. Prof. Nathaniel Schmidt, Colgate University. Μαρὰν ἀθα, I Cor. xvi. 22.
11. Prof. M. S. Terry, Garrett Biblical Institute. The scope and plan of the Apocalypse of John.
12. Prof. George F. Moore, Andover Theological Seminary. I Kings vii. 46 and the question of Succoth (read by Prof. Lyon).
13. Rev. W. Scott Watson, Guttenberg, N. J. Two Samaritan manuscripts of portions of the Pentateuch (read in abstract).

Papers by Prof. J. P. Peters, New York, and Prof. H. V. Hilprecht, University of Pennsylvania, were read at the Second Joint Session, Friday, December 28.

## THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA.

(Organized 1883.)

1. Prof. W. T. Hewett, Cornell University. The life and works of Prof. Matthias de Vries.
2. Dr. K. Francke, Harvard University. The relation of early German romanticism to the classic ideal.
3. Prof. George Lyman Kittredge, Harvard University. *The Friar's Lantern*.
4. Prof. Edward H. Magill, Swarthmore College. The new method in Modern Language study.
5. Prof. Frederic Spencer, University of North Wales, Bangor, Wales. On the reform of methods in teaching the Modern Languages, together with an experiment in the teaching of German.
6. Prof. Alex. Melville Bell, Washington, D. C. A note on syllabic consonants.
7. Prof. Henry R. Lang, Yale University. The metres employed by the earliest Portuguese lyric school.
8. Dr. J. Hendren Gorrell, Wake Forest College, N. C. Indirect discourse in Anglo-Saxon.
9. Prof. O. F. Emerson, Cornell University. A parallel between the Middle English poem *Patience* and one of the pseudo-Terullian poems.
10. Mr. W. Henry Schofield, Harvard University. Elizabeth Elstob: an Anglo-Saxon scholar nearly two centuries ago, with her *Plea for Learning in Women*.
11. Dr. C. C. Marden, Johns Hopkins University. The Spanish dialect of Mexico City.
12. Prof. C. H. Ross, Agricultural and Mechanical College, Ala. Henry Timrod and his poetry.
13. Prof. James T. Hatfield, Northwestern University. The poetry of Wilhelm Müller.
14. Dr. L. E. Menger, Johns Hopkins University. Early Romanicists in Italy.
15. Dr. Edwin S. Lewis, Princeton University. On the development of inter-vocalic labials in the Romanic languages.
16. Dr. L. A. Rhodes, Cornell University. Notes on Goethe's *Iphigenie*.
17. Mr. Alex. W. Herdler, Princeton University. On the Slavonic languages.

18. Dr. Thomas A. Jenkins, Philadelphia. Old French equivalents of Latin substantives in *-cus*, *-gus*, *-vus*.
19. Prof. A. R. Hohlfeld, Vanderbilt University. Contributions to a bibliography of Racine (read by title).

A paper by Prof. Hermann Collitz, Bryn Mawr College, was read at the Second Joint Session, Friday, December 28.

---

AMERICAN DIALECT SOCIETY.

(Organized 1888.)

Prof. E. S. Sheldon, Harvard University, read a paper at the Second Joint Session, Friday, December 28.

---

SPELLING REFORM ASSOCIATION.

(Organized 1876.)

1. Opening remarks by President March : "The movement for spelling reform."

2. Paper by H. L. Wayland, D.D., Editor of the *Examiner* : "The obstacles to reform."

3. Remarks by James W. Walk, M.D., Commissioner of Charities and Correction, Philadelphia : "The advantage of a reformed orthography to the children of the poor."

4. Remarks by Charles P. G. Scott, Ph.D., Editor of *Worcester's Dictionary* : "The attitude of philologists toward the spelling reform."

5. Remarks by Patterson Du Bois, A.M., of Philadelphia.

6. Remarks by J. H. Allen, of Massachusetts.

7. Remarks by Mrs. E. B. Burns, of New York.

---

ARCHÆOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OF AMERICA.

(Organized 1879.)

1. Mrs. Sara Y. Stevenson, University of Pennsylvania. The antiquities from Koptos at the University of Pennsylvania.
2. Rev. W. C. Winslow, Boston, Mass. The explorations at the temple of Queen Hatasu.

3. Mr. Talcott Williams, *The Press*, Philadelphia. Local Moorish architecture in North Morocco.
4. Prof. Frank B. Tarbell, University of Chicago. Retrograde inscriptions on Attic vases.
5. Prof. John Williams White, Harvard University. History and work of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
6. Prof. William R. Ware, Columbia College, N. Y. The New American School of Architecture at Rome.
7. Prof. William H. Goodyear, Brooklyn Institute. A discovery of Greek horizontal curves in the Maison Carrée at Nîmes.
8. Rev. John P. Peters, New York. The Excavations of the Babylonian Expedition at the temple of Bel in Nippur.
9. Prof. Allan Marquand, Princeton University. A study in Greek architectural proportions.
10. Prof. Myron R. Sanford, Middlebury College. The new faun of the Quirinal.
11. Prof. W. C. Lawton, Philadelphia. Accretions to the Troy myth after Homer.
12. Mr. Barr Ferree, Brooklyn. Architecture of mediæval houses in France.
13. Prof. A. L. Frothingham, Jr., Princeton University. Byzantine influence upon Mediæval Italy.
14. The ivory throne at Ravenna.
15. Mr. William Rankin, Jr., Princeton University. Some early Italian pictures in American galleries.
16. Prof. Alfred Emerson, Cornell University. The archæology of Athenian politics in the fifth century B.C.

A paper by Prof. Federico Halbherr, University of Rome, was read at the Second Joint Session, on Friday, December 28.